Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2026

https://archive.org/details/studyofliberalco0000leon_o2v4

A STUDY OF
THE LIBERAL COLLEGE

BY
LEON B. RICHARDSON
Professor of Chemistry
in
Dartmouth College

A REPORT TO
THE PRESIDENT
OF DARTMOUTH COLLEGE

HANOVER, NEW HAMPSHIRE
1924

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PART I

CHAPTER		PAGE
I	The American College, a Unique Institution	11
II	The Purpose of the College	17
III	Scholarship	24
IV	Criticisms of the College	29
V	Handicaps under which the College Labors 1. The Background of the Student	32
VI	Handicaps under which the College Labors 2. Social Life. Activities and Fraternities	45
VII	Handicaps under which the College Labors 3. Athletics	53
VIII	The Problem of the College	61

PART II

IX	The British System of Higher Education	65
	The English University	66
X	The English Pre-University Training	72

CHAPTER PAGE

XI The Older Universities 78
Oxford 78
Its General Atmosphere 78
The College System 80

XII Oxford 85
Admission Requirements 85

XIII Oxford 89
Pass and Honors Courses 89

XIV Oxford 98
Methods of Instruction 98
The Tutorial System 98
Examinations 104

XV Oxford 107
Athletics 107

XVI Cambridge 112

XVII The University of London 121

XVIII The University of Durham 131

XIX The Provincial Universities 135

XX The Scotch Universities 144

XXI Canadian Universities 156

XXII Summary 159

PART III

XXIII The Curriculum 162

XXIV A Suggested Change 176

CHAPTER PAGE

XXV Obstacles to the Suggested Curriculum 184
The "Snap" Course 184
The Arts and Science Degrees 186

XXVI Methods of Instruction 192
The Lecture System 192
Recitations 197
Small Sections 199
The Number of Courses Taken 200

XXVII Learning vs. Thinking 202

XXVII Examinations 209

XXIX Special Treatment of Freshmen 213
Courses of a General Nature 215

XXX The Comprehensive Examination 221
The Tutorial System 221

XXXI The Treatment of Exceptional Students 232
The Honors Course 232

XXXII The Teacher 243

XXXIII The Training of the Teacher 264
The Graduate School 264
The Inexperienced Teacher 272

XXXIV Student Participation 275

XXXV Summary 279

INSTITUTIONS VISITED

UNITED STATES

Harvard	Smith	Western Reserve	Washington
Brown	Columbia	Case School	Carleton
Yale	Princeton	Oberlin	Wisconsin
Amherst	Swarthmore	Chicago	Michigan
Williams	Haverford	Knox	

CANADA

Toronto McGill

ENGLAND

Oxford	London	Manchester	Bristol
Cambridge	Durham	Birmingham	Winchester

City of London School

SCOTLAND

Edinburgh St. Andrews Glasgow

INTRODUCTION

October fifteen, 1924

Dear Mr. President,

During the academic year 1923-24, I was asked by you to devote a portion of my time to the investigation of the purposes and methods of representative colleges of liberal arts, and to the formation of some idea of the direction in those institutions of movements which look toward a betterment of conditions prevailing within them. Through the cooperation of the Trustees I was enabled to travel somewhat extensively and to visit colleges and universities in this country, Canada, and Great Britain. The results of this inquiry are contained in the report which is submitted herewith.

Although the direct purpose of the investigation has been to suggest for discussion modifications of the system prevailing at Dartmouth College, it has seemed best to put the report into a general form, and to state the problems as those prevailing, to a greater or less degree, in all colleges of liberal arts. Little attention, therefore, has been given to those conditions which are merely local in their nature: the report is an attempt to estimate the strength and the weakness of the American college as an institution, and to suggest methods by which its efficiency may, perhaps, be improved.

Discussions of educational methods, from the nature of the thing discussed, are apt to soar into the realms of theory. A central guiding principle is set up, and is then pushed to all its logical conclusions without much

regard to the workability of the methods which result. It has been a conscious purpose in this report to avoid such a tendency. Whenever changes are advocated it has been the endeavor to make sure that they are practicable as well as desirable. It cannot be hoped that in all cases success has been attained in this endeavor but nevertheless the attempt has been made ever to consider practicability as the guiding principle. Nor because definite conclusions have been drawn should it be thought that these conclusions are stated in a dogmatic spirit. It is true that they appeal to the writer as the logical results of the premises involved, but he is under no illusions as to the inerrancy of his judgment. As the starting points of discussion, however, tangible propositions are of more value than inchoate masses of evidence. As this report has as its sole purpose the stimulation of discussion it is hoped that with such an end in view whatever conclusions may be drawn are not without value.

The writer wishes that it were possible to thank individually those connected with the many institutions visited who did so much to make the investigation both profitable and pleasurable. The uniform courtesy and attention of administrative officers and teachers, their interest in the investigation, the care which they took to make available all possible information concerning their individual institutions, their readiness to furnish introductions, all combined largely to remove whatever elements of drudgery were inherent in the work, and to make the task a peculiarly pleasant one. Space does not permit the publication of so lengthy a list. He cannot refrain, however, from expressing his gratitude to Mr. R. H. Simpson, Secretary of the American University Union at London, through whose unfailing courtesy so many meetings with British educational leaders were arranged, and the objects of that portion of the investigation thereby made more easy of attain-

ment. Nor does he wish to close without expressing his appreciation to you, Mr. President, and to the Trustees, for the opportunity of engaging in a work the pursuit of which has proved so pleasant and of so much personal value.

Respectfully submitted,

Leon B. Richardson

President Ernest M. Hopkins
Dartmouth College
Hanover, N. H.

PART I

Chapter I

THE AMERICAN COLLEGE—A UNIQUE INSTITUTION

THE American college is a direct offshoot of the corresponding English institution of the seventeenth century. Harvard, whose plan the other pre-revolutionary colleges more or less closely followed, was founded in a region the intellectual leadership of which was exercised by graduates of the English universities; in particular of Cambridge. The proportion of college trained men among the early settlers of New England was remarkably large; larger perhaps than it was in that community for many years thereafter. The religious and therefore the political ascendancy in a theocratic state was in their hands; and their obvious model for a new college, whose first class entered only ten years after the founding of Salem. was the institution which had formed their own early years, Harvard was a miniature Emmanuel, with such differences as might come from a Calvinistic rather than an Episcopal background; but with a purpose not essentially different from that of its parent, and with a curriculum and a discipline quite the same.

In the minds of their founders, the purpose of Harvard and the institutions which followed it was quite clear. Intellectual leadership was vested in the clergy. It was therefore necessary that the degree of educational superiority which the early ministers brought with them as a result of their English training should be available to their successors in institutions near at hand. The prime purpose of Harvard was to supply a "literate" ministry, and Brown, a century later, when the Baptist clergy was for the most part made up of uncultivated men, had as its distinct object the training of a ministry which should be at less intellectual disadvantage in competitions with its better trained rivals. The same purpose, and curiously enough practically the same methods, were followed by Wheelock in preparing at Dartmouth Indian leaders who should spread the Gospel among their brethren.

But although "the one principal and proposed end in erecting the college was to supply the churches with a learned, pious and orthodox ministry," it would be a mistake to assume that the methods were technical rather than general. As President Faunce points out, if the college was vocational, the vocation for which it prepared was of the broadest and most fundamental character. In its narrow curriculum less than one quarter of the studies had a direct bearing on the clerical calling. As a matter of fact, as time went on, the career of the graduate of the college became less and less clerical. In the decade from 1761 to 1770, as shown by Dr. Meiklejohn, the proportion of ministers among Harvard graduates was 29%; Yale, 32%; Princeton, 45%; Brown (first thirty years), 25%. Of the graduates of the first twenty-five classes of Dartmouth 41% became ministers. But as the destination of the graduate shifted, the same curriculum, the same basis of Greek and Latin, mathematics and philosophy, with a smattering of theology and divinity, was found to be as well fitted for the fundamental training of the lawyer, the physician, the teacher, and even the man of business, as it was for that of the ministry. As Dr. Meiklejohn says:

"In the old colonial community the clergyman, as in lesser degree, the lawyer and the teacher, was the man of ideas. He was no mere teacher of the gospel and tender of the parish. While people lived their lives it was his task to reflect on living, to formulate the belief on which it was based; to study the conditions by which it was molded; to bring to clearness the problems by which it was faced; to study the moral, social, economic, political situations of which it was constituted. It was his part and the part of men of like intellectual development to attempt to understand the lives which other men were living with lesser degrees of understanding. It was his task to serve as a prophet and seer, as guide and counselor of his people. It was for that task that the liberal college was intended to prepare him."

With this high, if perhaps only partially conscious, purpose the American college started on its career. How meagre seem its beginnings! The Harvard of the seventeenth century was a boarding school for boys. Its curriculum was narrow, although perhaps not unduly so considering the range of knowledge of the times. Freshmen frequently entered at the age of twelve, and were treated by their teachers like the boys they were. Flogging was still practised up to the end of the eighteenth

century, and most minute rules for the government of the students were features of academic discipline in most colleges to the middle of the nineteenth. College work consisted in large part of formal recitations from set text books; exercises of a character most machine-like and uninspired. But the institutions were small; the opportunity for contact between teacher and taught was large; the student body was composed in the main of ambitious youths who were receiving an education at a sacrifice both to themselves and their families. The result, despite the narrow range of subjects covered, was a body of graduates whose initiative, powers of leadership, and influence in the community, have hardly been equalled since. Moreover, it was a time when graduation from college carried with it a prestige, both in the estimation of the public and in eyes of the graduate himself, far higher than it has enjoyed in any recent period. So the college developed under conditions far from unfavorable.

In this development there seems to have been little contact between the institutions of America and those of England. Students from this side of the ocean who, before the revolution, sought an education in Europe were quite as likely to find the Scottish universities to their taste as the English. There no troublesome theological tests stood in their way. Moreover Oxford was at this period at its lowest intellectual ebb. So the influence of the parent institutions was hardly felt at Harvard and Yale. When, after the revolution, the American student looked to a foreign land for the completion of his training, it was the German university which fixed his gaze rather than the English. The example set by Ticknor and Everett was followed by an increasing number of ambitious young Americans, and through their efforts it was Germany rather than England that was to exercise the predominant influence upon higher American education in the nineteenth century. Thus, while the American college was modeled so closely upon its English prototype in methods and purpose, the development of each, with little contact with the other, has resulted in institutions so diverse that it is difficult to believe that their origin is a common one.

The real development of American higher education is almost entirely the work of the last seventy years. The college of 1850 was much as it had been in 1700. There were modi-

fications, it is true, but they were relatively small. Perhaps the requirements were somewhat higher; the curriculum may have been changed in details; the treatment of the student body may have been modified for the better; but in essence, the purpose, the methods, and the machinery of collegiate instruction were those of the preceeding century. Then came a deluge of new ideas, of new methods, which seemed to bid fair to swamp all the principles which had so long held sway. New studies—first the natural sciences, and then the social sciences—clamored for admission, not on suffrance, but on terms of equality with the time-honored subjects of the curriculum, and won their fight. The principle of more or less complete freedom of student election struck a blow at the very nerve center of the system of former years. The professional schools, existing before, if at all, as lightly regarded adjuncts of the undergraduate college, became self-assertive and conscious of their importance as coordinate members of the educational system. Schools of technology and engineering and business were developed. From the German university was brought back the idea of the importance of investigation as an indispensable part of any system of higher education; and the graduate school was added to the already complex mass. Women demanded equal rights with men, and gained them. The states extended their educational system to the higher realms of learning, and brought, through tax-supported institutions, the most advanced work within the reach of all. The secondary schools, public and private, were developed until they claimed the greater portion of the field covered by the college of a hundred years ago. If we examine the whole history of education it will not be easy to find a period so brief in which so complete a change of educational outlook and so sharp a modification of method has taken place as has been witnessed in the United States by men still alive.

In place of the modest institution with its limited numbers, its patriarchal discipline, its restricted curriculum, we now have at the peak of our educational system the great university, with its hordes of students, its relative freedom, its multiplicity of schools. "I would found," said Ezra Cornell, "an institution where any person can receive instruction in any study." If we add that the opportunity is given for such of these persons as wish to do so to devote their efforts to the extension of knowledge, we have the spirit of the modern university. In the chaos

which would seem to result from the rapidity of the changes outlined above, what has been the fate of the liberal college?

Obviously it would be logical to expect its disappearance. Pressed from above by the development of graduate instruction, and from below by the extension of the public secondary school, and its off-shoot the junior college; hemmed in by the professional schools with their ever-increasing demands on the time of the student; its purpose out of touch with the narrowly utilitarian requirements of the age; there seems good reason to fear that it either would be squeezed out of existence or its field so narrowly restricted as to make its place in the educational system one of relatively slight importance. There has been no lack of educational leaders who have predicted this fate for the college. Thus President Butler, writing of the institution in 1902, called attention to the fact that at least two years of the work done by the old college is now done by the preparatory school. He believed it evident that, with the increase in the age for admission from 15 or 16 to 18, with the demands of the professional school, the college will in one or two generations cease to exist if it still demands the full four years. In his opinion its purpose should not be confused by making its last year or last two years more or less professional. To save the college, which is the distinctively American feature of our educational system, and which must at all odds be saved, he would cut down its course to two or three years. President Jordan, writing in 1903 of the independent college, asserted:

"Every successful college points toward the university and so far as possible strives to become such. The college is a small university; antiquated, belated, arrested, starved as the case may be; but with university aspirations to be realized in such degree as it can. As time goes on the college will disappear, in fact, if not in name. The best will become universities, the others will return to their place as academies."

Nearly a generation has gone by since these confident predictions were made, and there is little indication that their verification is approaching. In fact there has never been a time when the college, either as a branch of the university or as an independent institution, has seemed more alive, more virile, more confident of its position, than today. There has never been a time when its recognition as the heart of the American system of higher education has been more general. There has

never been a time when those branches of its curriculum commonly called liberal, as distinguished from those which prepare for the vocational schools, have been more valued by its students. And there has never been a time when it has been less complacent, or more anxious to modify its policy for the best interests of those under its charge.

It is certainly true that the college is the one part of our educational system which is distinctively American. The continental student proceeds directly from the secondary school to the university; the college is squeezed out between them. In England the provincial university gives, in general, a technical training; while Oxford and Cambridge differ so widely in method from any American institution that comparison is hardly possible. The Scotch university is much like the American college in purpose, but again the method is quite apart from ours. Thus the college is a normal development from American conditions, and has a character all its own. It may be submerged in a great university, in which it must contend for its position among many conflicting interests; it may be the dominating feature of a smaller university; it may make up in itself the whole institution. But whatever the form may be the problem is essentially the same. The institution must reckon that its entering students are boys and for a time must be treated as such; that in the course of their college career they become men, and must be so treated. In no other educational system is this change of method required; in other lands this change coincides with a transfer from one institution to another. The problem thus presents difficulties of a peculiar kind, and makes the task of the college one not met with elsewhere. Failure to solve it properly (sometimes failure to recognize its existence) brings dire results in its train. On the other hand, the situation brings to the college opportunities for service all its own. So the college and all those associated with it must have clearly in mind what those opportunities are, and how they are to be met; it must have a well-defined and clearly recognized purpose.

Chapter II

THE PURPOSE OF THE COLLEGE

WHAT then, in view of the opportunities and liabilities presented to the American college, shall be its objective?

There is no lack of definition. It has always been the task of presidents and other administrative officers to justify the existence of institutions under their charge; to convince the public that the advantages gained from the college justify the removal of young men and women from the business of the world for four years at the very beginning of the productive period. These definitions are not in the main contradictory, but in two particulars they are sometimes unsatisfactory. From the nature of the thing defined an element of vagueness, a lack of direct focus, is at times observed. Real want of clearness of ideas may be concealed by verbiage, which may impress but does not inform. In other words, the type of thought misnamed academic is not absent from the productions of educational leaders. More common, however, is the substitution of subsidiary and indirect factors for the main purpose; and over-emphasis of results relatively remote, and a neglect of the immediate aim from which it is hoped these results may be gained.

When we consider all aspects of the problem we must, I think, come to the conclusion that the purpose of the college is primarily intellectual. It is almost obvious that so far as the training of the intellect becomes a diminishing factor in the ideals of the institution, so far is it failing in its efforts; so far as such training is the center of its life, so far is it fulfilling its obligations to the community. The college must do other things than train the intellect, but it must see to it that such intellectual training is never lost sight of as its guiding principle. *Our aim may therefore be stated as the stimulation and development of those gifts of intellect with which nature has endowed the student, so that he becomes, first, a better companion to himself through life, and, second, a more efficient force in his contacts with his fellow men.* The process is two-fold. The undergraduate must first become acquainted

with the work of men of the past; with the facts which they have accumulated; with the conclusions which they have drawn. But if the process stops at that point it is of little avail: real education has but just begun. Starting with the basis thus gained, and with consideration of and respect for the conclusions of the great figures of the past, he must then be trained to think for himself, to formulate his own philosophy of life, to be modest, but modestly self-reliant, in the world of thought. Such a process is not easy. The accumulation of fact in itself involves drudgery, self discipline, restraint. Moreover thinking, in the real sense, is a process painful to the average man; it is easier to take opinions ready formed. President Butler may be extreme, and is certainly ungallant, in his assertion that the labor of forming opinions for themselves is too much for most men and almost all women, but he is quite right when he says that clear thinking can be gained only by practice. He might have added that thinking so-called—rambling speculation unchecked by knowledge of or respect for underlying fact—is a growing vice, not only among college students, but among the American people as a whole.

Although the process thus described be none of the easiest, the result, if attained, is well worth the time and labor. The surprise in finding that the intellectual life is in the long run pleasant rather than irksome; the recognition of a new resource not to be lost through life; the sense of power over one's mental equipment; the feeling of companionship with the great minds of the past; the establishment of points of contact with so many of those whom one meets in the work of the day: all these make of life a continuing adventure quite beyond the scope of that man whose intellectual interest has never been aroused. If the college, profiting by its unique opportunity of acting upon the youth at the period when from a boy he is becoming a man, is successful in the work of arousing and stimulating his intellectual curiosity, it will be found to have justified its existence.

While therefore the work of the college, if successful, is useful in the highest degree, it destroys its own effectiveness if conducted in a spirit which is utilitarian. If a parent is anxious to determine the direct financial value which individual courses, or the course as a whole, may have for his boy, he can be given no satisfactory answer. If the advantages outlined above do not appeal to him, if his look remains fast on dollars and cents, he had much better place his son in an institution of a different type.

The advice to the student of such educational writers as Mr. Birdseye, "Take up no study without some utility in it that you can see, understand and value," would, if followed in a narrow sense, destroy the very spirit of the liberal college. There is a difference in utilities and one of the tasks of the college is properly to separate and value them. It is the habit of some to look for statistical proof of the practical worth of the college degree; to count the number of graduates enrolled in Who's Who; to collect information of the earning capacity of college men; to point to the number of presidents and others high in public life who have received a college training. Such attempts at measurement are futile, and in fact often defeat their own purpose: for the individual of prominence selected as a college product may well be one to whose motives and methods no college would point with pride, while quite frequently the most worthy graduate of the institution is the relatively obscure individual whose inner life is so rich and full as to make him a happy man and a source of happiness to those among whom he dwells. It ought of course to be true that one who has really received the advantages which the college is supposed to offer should be more successful in any career than is one who lacks them. In the words of President Wilson:

"The merely skilled man is always a servant, with a chance through change of method that his services will not be needed. What the world needs at the top is not a few but many men with the power to organize and guide. The college is meant to stimulate in a considerable number of men what would be stimulated in only a few if we were to depend entirely upon nature and circumstances."

But after all, the claim of the college to its place must rest not on the material aid which it affords to its graduates, but to the enlargement which it should bring to their lives. We must eat, it is true, but after eating, what then?

Nevertheless, we must not push our principle to such an extreme as to destroy its validity. There is a tendency among some who are guardians of the college to divide the curriculum into the vocational and the liberal; to exclude the former and to hold fast to the latter; to discriminate by subjects rather than by spirit. We do not normally include carpentry in the curriculum of the college, while we always do include Latin; although it is possible—with some stretch of the imagination, it is true,—to conceive of

the former, in the hands of an inspiring teacher, as essentially liberal, while no particular effort is required to bring to mind courses in the latter, even those given by eminent specialists, which are nothing but vocational. Such comparisons are, of course, extreme; but in general it is the spirit of the teacher rather than the subject matter which divides training from education. Moreover, training is always a part of education, and, as such, the college must do its share in meeting its demands. We cannot expect the boy through the four years of his college life entirely to give up contact with the things which interest him; to lose touch with the demands of the career which is to be his. In these cultural years we should see the student well started in the direction which he is later to follow, not only in knowledge but to some extent in method. The anxious fears of those who are continually on the guard lest something with the taint of vocationalism should slip into the curriculum of the liberal college are hardly justified, either in theory or in fact. With the purpose of the institution as a guide, keeping firmly to its spirit, that college which has the advantage of sane common sense on the part of its leaders can hardly go far astray. The result will be neither a mass of cultural material with no direct application to the future work of the individual, nor an aggregate of special information with no illumination from the great world of thought outside, but a judicious combination of the two, each vivified by continual contact with the other.

But what are we to say of the somewhat pretentious statements of the purpose of the college which eminent educators sometimes set forth: purposes which have the advantages of a glamor to which the matter-of-fact discussion above can have no claim? We are told by some that the purpose of the college is to train for public service; for devotion to the common weal. Others raise the shibboleth of training for citizenship. An eminent professor has devoted a book to the somewhat vague thesis that America is the educational motive of the age, and the obligation of the college is the promotion of the American social order. Others stress the training for leadership, and the student, flattered as a Freshman by the unexpected deference paid to him by some eminent publicist as the future leader of the community, becomes the prey of intense boredom when the hundredth publicist comes with the same tale in his senior year. And so it goes.

If these statements are analyzed, what becomes of their validity? If the intellectual curiosity of the boy has been inspired, if he has acquired a taste for study and the beginnings of a habit of reasoning for himself on the basis of acquired fact, if, in short, he is beginning really to think, he will of course be more likely to take an interest in public affairs, to be more effective in his application of that interest; he may even be able to figure out what the learned professor means by the promotion of the American social order; he certainly will be a more effective leader if innate powers of leadership are his. But how is a college, in cold blood, deliberately and consciously, to plan its work for the fulfillment of purposes like these? How are we to train for citizenship except by training in intelligence? How are we to train for leadership at all? How are we to train for devotion to the public service? Moral lectures on the obligations of the college man to the public weal seldom leave a deep impression, and what impression may be made is destroyed by endless repetition. In short, these objects, as the conscious and direct purposes of the college, are utterly incapable of realization. If attained at all, as they often are, they come as corollaries to the careful and thorough training of the intellect.

Not so easy to dismiss is the purpose set up by many; the training of character. It is obvious that the development of intelligence uncontrolled by moral purpose becomes a danger rather than a help to the state. To go to extremes, a college which should turn loose upon the community a body of highly intellectual criminals would not long be allowed to exist. Every college teacher is familiar with students in whom the highly developed intellect is directed by motives the reverse of praiseworthy. Such students are likely to come to the public eye in ways which are not flattering to the institution deemed to be responsible for them.

The old college had a perfectly definite idea of how character should be developed; namely through moral, and particularly through religious, instruction. Such a view still exists in many institutions, especially in the denominational colleges. It ranges all the way from denunciation of the "damnable doctrine of evolution" to the most enlightened and sympathetic consideration of the religious and moral needs of the student. In some cases the attempt is made to shield the student from religious and therefore moral heresies. Other institutions have largely

abandoned the effort to inculcate morality or religion by formal instruction; or at any rate by required courses. It is quite impossible to compare definitely the graduates of the two classes of institutions, but their moral tone seems to be much the same. It is certainly true that it is higher among the graduates of the eastern college than it was fifty years ago; in days when watching was more careful.

This discussion does not, however, quite hit the idea of character, which is too subtle to pin to a religious basis. All are agreed that it is most highly desirable that the student should leave a college with a moral stamina which will carry him successfully through the storms of life, but the question again rises, how is it to be done? The difficulty is best set forth by President Wilson. "Conscious cultivation of character," he says, "produces nothing but that which makes a man intolerable to his fellows. Character is a by-product." So again we seem to be left in the dark as to the mode of attack. Fortunately, the influence of high character is contagious. There are men who from the force and sweetness of their personality and the loftiness of their outlook are radiating centers of goodness to all about. Most men in their younger years have come into contact with such personalities; personalities whose moral influence has been a lasting one on those with whom they have come in contact. The appeal of these men, exercised as it often is year after year upon the hundreds of men who pass through the college, is a power which only those who have experienced it can appreciate. Unfortunately, men who have the power to influence masses are not common, but all institutions have connected with them as teachers, administrators, or undergraduates, men who in their own way and in their own degree possess some measure of it. They are the invaluable members of the college community; to be kept in the circle at all cost, for through them alone can the influence of high ideals and high character be transmitted.

After all, we come back to the idea of the development of the intellect as the conscious purpose of the college: other results may be gained and will be gained, but they must be "by-products," and not the direct aims of the institution. So far the problem has been fairly simple. But when we ask the question, assuming the purpose of the college to be thus correctly defined, in what measure does the institution meet the test, the answer is far from satisfactory.

Let us ask ourselves a series of questions.

The president and administrative officers, from their position, are best able to look at the institution as a whole. Do they sufficiently emphasize the purpose of the college? Do they impress on all connected with the institution the necessity of the subordination of its individual branches for the attainment of that purpose?

Do the alumni recognize the true purpose of the college? Do they regard their own undergraduate course as satisfying that purpose? Do they urge a correct understanding of it on those who are entering their college career?

Do students as a class ever seriously consider what the college should really give them?

Do parents, before sending sons to college, weigh the fundamental purpose of the institution? Do they try to form an estimate of how well such purposes are carried out? Do they consider whether such purposes fit the needs of their own boys?

Are members of college faculties interested in education, as distinguished from training in their individual specialties? Do they think of the college as an institution with a definite purpose; if so, do they mold their own teaching to the best carrying out of that purpose?

It may be that an institution exists in which all the questions in this list can be answered in satisfactory fashion. I have not, however, found such a college. It is certainly true that in all colleges some parts of the test would be found to be satisfactory. Otherwise, the situation would be hopeless indeed. But it seems evident that much of the criticism of the college is based upon the failure of its component parts to recognize what its purpose really is, or if that purpose is recognized, to fail to act intelligently toward its attainment. The body of this report will therefore be an attempt to estimate the extent of this failure, and to suggest directions in which remedy may be sought.

Chapter III

SCHOLARSHIP

IF we accept the purpose of the college as outlined in the preceding section, its ideal becomes that of scholarship. Immediately we are confronted with the necessity of definition; for no word is more misunderstood; none from misuse has more deteriorated from its high estate than this. In a recent report of a committee on educational policy of the Dartmouth faculty, the main thesis was the necessity of making scholarship more than it now is the center of the life of the college. The response of the leaders of the undergraduate body—thoughtful men, truly interested in the intellectual development of the institution—was illuminating. Although it was evident that they were entirely in agreement with the thesis of the committee, they would have nothing to do with scholarship as the aim of the average college student. Much time was wasted in the attempt to convince these men that what the committee meant by scholarship was what they meant by "education." They remained firm in their opinion that scholarship was for the ordinary college graduate a piece of baggage which he was better off without.

What the committee meant by scholarship was exactly that which has been summed up in the preceding section; the development of the man who knows and who, on the basis of what he knows, can think. But a virtue when pushed to extreme becomes a particularly nauseating vice, and scholarship is no exception. The vice of scholarship is pedantry, and it is safe to say that no one factor has so much to do with the low esteem of true scholarship in the college as this. If the complaint, surely quite baseless, of the Oxford don, "Our men are not scholars and our scholars are not men," can be justly applied to any institution, that institution will fail of accomplishing its purpose.

After all the pedant is not a scholar. If he is an undergraduate the "weir" or "grind," he is merely an acquisitive machine, with little proper power to digest the mass of fact which he takes in. It turns to fat, often largely centered in the head, rather

than to intellectual bone and muscle and sinew. He is the scholastic Daniel Lambert; of value only as a horrible example. The faculty pedant likewise has missed the true aim of scholarship. He is narrow, meticulous in trifles, unable to grasp large issues. He repels rather than attracts; he makes the intellectual life seem sordid rather than high; a task of drudgery rather than a thing of joy. In the words of Dr. Fitch:

"Pure learning sometimes degenerates into pedantry. The scholar is always in danger of becoming the scholastic. Much learning often dehumanizes men. They sink to a narrow intensity of vision within their own departments. Their specialty is just before their eyes, its little province obscuring the great kingdoms of the world. With the measuring rod of their detached learning they mistakenly gauge the universe; theirs is a text book philosophy. They become provincials left behind in some side eddy by the great stream of human life, unable any longer to enter into and sympathize with its normal and essential experiences. All the bitter flings at scholarship which practical men of every time have made, all the semi-contemptuous references to the teacher and the professor are partly due to this fact; that scholarship has too often carried the scholar out of that area of vital and elemental experience where most men live their lives, and where the indispensable things of life are found." And so as, "the freshman is never told what scholarship really is, he identifies as a result the scholar with the scholastic and erudition with pedantry."

If this is true, it is easy to see why the student is unresponsive when scholarship is set before him as the ideal of the institution.

While this picture is accurate, it would be misleading if left in its bald outlines. As a matter of fact truth, as a whole, can seldom be conveyed by sharp contrasts; it is a matter of half tones. It must be admitted that the American student who pursues the intellectual life labors under certain handicaps. The fundamental assumption that all men are created equal is likely to be interpreted that all men are of equal intellectual mediocrity. The idea of "normalcy" is carried into the world of thought as well as into that of business, and the normal man, in his intellectual life, as distinguished from the activities which bring him his daily bread, is generally found upon analysis to belong to a class not so far as it ought to be above that rejoicing in the name of moron. The average American may resent the implication that he is stupid, that his moral code might be improved, that his range of interest is small; but two assertions he is sure to resent;

that he has no sense of humor and that he is a "high-brow." So the American people as a class, intolerant of the appearance of intellectual superiority among them, have instinctively adopted the most efficient way of destroying it; namely, to become contemptuous of it.

The undergraduate college, from the nature of things, must reflect this spirit. It is true that in it intellectual superiority when combined with the qualities which make a man agreeable to his fellows is given the highest recognition. No man is more esteemed than the good student who at the same time is a good fellow. But the burden of proof is put upon him. Allowances are made for the mediocre intellect; his qualities, unless obviously unpleasant, are taken for granted; he works out his position in the college world on an even basis with others. But the moment a man shows intellectual superiority, or even manifests unusual interest in those things which the college is for, he at once falls under suspicion. He must *show* that he is not possessed of the pride of intellect; he must *show* that he has in his makeup elements of good fellowship; he must *show* that he conforms sufficiently to the normal college type not to be a marked man. In his case, nothing is taken for granted; it must be a demonstrated fact. It frequently happens that for the man of contemplative type this is not easy to do. He is likely to lack those inborn qualities which at first glance attract his fellows; he may be shy, and timid of self-assertion. But he cannot expect the student body to meet him even halfway; to make special efforts to penetrate his shell of reticence. So, with little opportunity to reveal his real measure as a human being, he is likely to fall back upon books as his companions and, while profiting in intellectual development from his college course, to fail to gain from it that enlargement of sympathies which human contact confers. His fellows set him down as a prig and a grind and regard him with little respect. As a matter of fact, nothing is farther from the truth. Very likely he obtains, with no notable expenditure of time, the modicum of fact which, regurgitated in machine-like fashion, assure him of high rank; his leisure is devoted to self-education—so far as it can be obtained from books—to his greatest profit.

This is but one type of the so-called grind or shark: there are others equally misunderstood. In fact, nothing is so fallible as student judgment in this respect. Twenty-five years after

graduation, the estimate is quite different. Many a man, his college career over, confronted for the first time with that most pressing problem, how shall he eat at his own expense, finds that the cultivation of human companionship and human sympathies are necessary for its solution. When the necessity arises he finds himself possessed, to his complete surprise, of a capacity for companionship which gives him in the community the place of a real man; a capacity which, if revealed in his college days, would have made his undergraduate career both more pleasurable and more profitable. In a recent letter to his classmates, the president of a college class, now twenty years from the day of graduation, after recalling some of the pleasures of his own undergraduate experience, said that his greatest regret in looking back on his college life was that he did not then better improve his opportunities to become on intimate terms with some whose subsequent careers had shown him that even at that time they had much to offer him. Of course he had in mind men of various types, but among them must have been those from whom he was repelled by the false imputation of pedantry attached to them.

The teacher also may be misjudged. If he does not inspire in at least some of the men under his charge a respect for things intellectual and an enthusiasm for their pursuit, he is certainly misplaced, but it may be only that. With a different class of students, perhaps in an institution of a different type, he may do work of the highest value. It may be that his seeming dryness and lack of human sympathy are really the results of shyness, of ingrained reticence, of fear of ridicule for the enthusiasms to which the scholastic life is supposed to be a stranger. Curious sympathies, curious interests, are sometimes revealed when the supposedly pedantic scholar is off his guard. The pity is that a mistaken sense of academic dignity permits him to be off his guard so seldom.

But with all these qualifications, pedantry in its worst form exists, both among students and teachers. So far as it exists, so far is the institution handicapped in the attempt to arouse real intellectual interest in those under its charge. Particularly damaging is its effect in the discouragement of those who might become scholars in the technical sense; who might devote their lives to the pursuit of knowledge and to its increase. The number of these men can never be large, but they are the salt of the earth, for upon them all intellectual advance depends. Any college

which allows the development of scholarship of this type to be repressed or hampered is an institution which has no moral right to exist; any college which does not with all its power encourage and aid the development of scholarly men among its students is recreant to its duty. But with the pedant as an example, those of scholarly tastes, imagination, and human interest are repelled from a scholarly career; while those lacking all the attributes of scholarship except plodding and unimaginative industry are attracted to it.

So it should be the object of the college:

(1) So far as possible to detect the pedant and to make it no longer possible for him, through a mistaken system of college grading, to pose as a success in his academic career.

(2) To search out, encourage, and sympathetically to assist the man of capacity to whom the scholarly career appeals.

(3) To raise in the great body of students interest and ideals which will make them, not scholars in the technical sense, but men to whom the intellectual appeal strikes a responsive note and ensures an understanding and sympathetic response.

This is what is meant by scholarship.

Chapter IV

CRITICISMS OF THE COLLEGE

PROBABLY on the eve of the establishment of the first American college various members of the little group of settlers near Boston began to express their entire disagreement with the purpose, with the methods, with the machinery of the yet un-named institution. At any rate, the effect of criticism was soon evident. The first president of Harvard was removed from office on account of a disagreement with the governing body caused by his mistaken view of the distinction between yours and mine, and by his brutality to the students under his charge; the second was also removed because he was unable to refrain on all public occasions from expressing his doubts of the efficacy of infant baptism; and the third was saved from a similar fate because he tempered his sincere adherence to the opposite, but equally serious, heresy (that the rite did not "take" unless the child was completely immersed) by a discretion which permitted him to refrain from stressing this view at the solemn academic festivities of the college. So it has gone from that day to this. No institution has been the subject of a greater body of criticism, intelligent and foolish, enlightened and bigoted, progressive and reactionary, than the college. That it has managed to maintain its existence, to say nothing of increasing its range of activity and usefulness, is an indication that it supplies a want in our educational system which could hardly otherwise be fulfilled.

It would be of little profit to mention more than a few of the many accusations brought against the college. Some of them are based on lack of knowledge or on prejudice, some tend to neutralize each other by being contradictory. Some are sympathetic and intelligent protests which no college can ignore. Many of them center about the intellectual life of the institution. President Garfield deplores the "weakening of the intellectual stamina of the undergraduate," and Professor Wendell says that "college education is chiefly notable for its ineffectiveness." An emphatic, if somewhat jaundiced, observer calls the college "a training

school for shamming and shirking. The most gigantic illusion of the age." Dr. Fitch laments the solemn pity "that many a youth comes of age and is graduated from college with a man's body and a boy's mind"; a charge which, if true, is particularly depressing in view of the purpose outlined in the preceding chapters. Some critics are definite as to the cause of the evil. The famous reference of President Wilson to the side shows and the main tent is too well known to require quotation. Dr. Charles L. Dana has stated that "the college boy is not educated, he does not want to be educated; but only to make his letter, his clubs, and in due season to graduate." Dr. Flexner asserts that "the American college is deficient and unnecessarily deficient alike in earnestness and in pedagogical intelligence: that in consequence our college students are and for the most part emerge flighty, superficial, and immature; lacking as a class concentration, seriousness and thoroughness." He also maintains that "courses are not aimed at the welfare of the student but are directed by the interests of the teacher." Professor Cattell brings the matter of responsibility to a head by declaring that "the collective unwisdom of a college faculty is not often exceeded by any individual student. Anyone who has observed a college faculty make a decision at one meeting and promptly reverse it at the next, without a particle of new evidence on the issue, is not unreasonably sceptical concerning the stability or worth of its decisions."

Enough has been quoted to show the character of these criticisms. If the reader is desirous of obtaining more, they may be found in the discussion of the Administration of the College Curriculum by Dr. Foster, at that time President of Reed College, published in 1911. In the thirteen years which have since elapsed there has been no diminution in their number or decrease in the violence of their tone. By their very vehemence some of them defeat their purpose and rouse in the academic mind amusement rather than perturbation. Many others embody the opinions of thoughtful and sober-minded men; men, moreover, who are genuinely devoted to the welfare of the college and who themselves make her service their lifework. The opinions of such men are not lightly to be dismissed.

Nor are they so dismissed. It may be fairly said that the college as an institution is awake to such evils as may be involved in its outlook and its processes. There is little self-complacency

or smugness in its attitude toward the problems that confront it. Woodrow Wilson, when president of Princeton, at a gathering of distinguished educators at which the statement had been frequently made that the college was under fire, said that he preferred the figure "on fire"; on fire with enthusiasm to meet the needs of the changing age. That surely is no mis-statement of the attitude of the college of today. If one goes from institution to institution with the attempt to discover in what way and how far the pressing problems of education are being attacked, the overpowering impression is that the colleges are alive to the issue; that their leaders are keenly intent on well directed advance; that stagnation, so far as educational outlook is concerned, is the one charge against them which cannot justly be raised. It may be that they are fumbling more or less in the dark; it may be that the periphery rather than the center of the problem seems under attack; it may be that earnest individuals with diverse views are so hauling in opposite directions that slight progress is made; it may be that the active leaders are swamped by the conservative timidity of the mass: but in every institution, in large degree or in small, appears plainly a sense of the solemn obligations of the college and of the need of meeting more efficiently the demands which can justly be made upon it. No one who comes in contact with this spirit can remain a pessimist when he looks to the future of our higher education.

Much of this report has to do with the varying methods which institutions have adopted to meet just criticism and to improve their influence upon the students under their charge. In many cases the criticisms are too inclusive; they have to do with conditions which are beyond the power of the college to remedy. There should be and is no intention of evading responsibility; of shifting to other shoulders the blame which belongs at home. But much confusion of thought and failure of correct deduction come from lumping together evils which have sources quite diverse. So, if for clearness only, it becomes necessary to discuss in some detail the nature of the material which comes to the college, to determine what undesirable factors it brings with it as a result of its contact with the social order of the times, and to estimate the handicap resulting therefrom under which the institution must work.

Chapter V

HANDICAPS UNDER WHICH THE COLLEGE LABORS

1. The Background of the Student

THE college is a machine for raising that which it takes in higher than its source. If it cannot do that, it is obvious that its purpose is not fulfilled. But, as in all machines of the kind, the level from which the start is made has much to do with the height which is reached. Impossible lifts cannot be expected of any hydraulic device. Any broad view of the college must therefore be prefaced by a consideration of the material which it receives; of the outlook of the home from which it comes, and the nature of the training which it receives in its pre-college years.

In a discussion of this kind, the difficulty is a tendency to draw sweeping generalizations of a situation too complex to admit of clear-cut classification. No one can set up hard and fast conclusions concerning the American home and the American school: conclusions which will be valid for all; or, in their entirety, for any one of them. All varieties exist; good and bad, efficient and wasteful. The good and the bad are likely to be so intermingled in any given case as to make possible definite judgment of it only as a result of a long and careful study. So conclusions which may be made in the discussion which follows are to be considered only in the light of tendencies of the age; tendencies which admit of all possible variations and even contradictions in innumerable individual cases, but which are sufficiently outstanding as to shed much light on the difficulties with which the college has to contend.

We may divide what is to be said into three parts: the intellectual background of the American home; the discipline of the American child; the American school.

The Cultural Background of the American Home

In the early days of the college the student body as a class came from relatively humble homes in which livelihood was obtained by manual toil. It is a pleasing picture of these families;

that while books were scarce, they were good: while time for reading was limited, it was well employed: that the Bible and Shakespeare and Milton were the bases on which the intellectual tastes of the children were formed. Such homes, perhaps, could be found; but they must have been rare. As a matter of fact, there is little evidence of any general devotion to books, of any particular attention to things of the intellect in the early days of America. There was, nevertheless, in the minds of the men of those times a deep respect for the product of the college, and often a resolution in the heart of the father that some, at least, of his sons should enjoy advantages which he himself did not have. Unquestionably much of his respect for the college was due to the social position of the graduate; to the fact that he was exempt from the manual toil which had been the lot of the older man; to his prestige in the community; to his easy advance to positions of leadership. But some of it surely came from a genuine appreciation of the advantages of the intellectual life. At all events the college, speaking generally, could count on a fairly definite level in the cultural status of those who came to it, and in nearly all cases could rely on the desire of the student to profit by whatever educational advantages the institution could offer. Thus its problem was a fairly simple one, compared with that which now confronts it.

As time went on, with the increase of wealth in the community, leadership largely shifted to the man of business: at any rate a business rather than a professional career began to make the largest appeal to the college graduate. Business, in essence, is an intellectual calling; and success in it in these days is increasingly dependent upon a wide point of view, upon the study of the situation and its interpretation in the light of the strict principles of logic, rather than upon mere superficial shrewdness. With the development of these qualities among business men—and they did develop—and with the continuous demand for time which business is supposed to make upon him who follows it, the business man comes to feel that there is no opportunity for the pursuit of the intellectual things of life: and—what is worse—he is likely to develop a contempt for them as impractical. The stock broker who felt obliged, lest it injure him in his daily work, to conceal from his fellows the fact that he had formed an interest in philosophy, that he had collected a library of works on philosophical subjects, and that he spent much of his leisure in reading

and speculation, was uncommonly unfortunate in his associates; but the case, though extreme, illustrates a condition that is not unusual. As Professor Canby points out, the ambition of the mediocre is what distinguishes the American social order, but it is likely to be an ambition for success in mediocrity. Too familiar is the picture of the business man who has bent his energies for years to the solution of the problem of how to eat, and who, having solved it, not only for himself but for several generations of his descendants, is confronted with the more difficult problem, what to do next. He may take refuge in golf, with apoplexy in its train as a result of his indignation at his own ineffectiveness; he may acquire works of art with no appreciation of their meaning; he may view the world from his yacht, and view it with unseeing eyes: he may, in despair, return to the business which he has left: but of the unfailing resources of the intellectual life he is ignorant: he is even blind to the fact that, as resources, they exist.

Such a man is always ambitious for his children; and commonly, college, as a part of their training, is taken for granted. If he is asked why, he is surprised at the question: and when the answer comes, it is likely to be vague, and to indicate that the purpose of the college is something concerning which he is entirely in the dark. He may dwell on the social advantages of college life, on possible athletic success and the fame coming therefrom; on varieties of contacts which develop graces of manner; on business opportunities coming from the friendships of college years; on the prestige of being a "Yale man" or a "Harvard man." He may talk vaguely of education, and, without clearness, of character building. But he seldom has in mind what he wants from the college for his boy, and exactly how he expects to get it. He almost never is sure what the prime purpose of the college is. The matter is likely to boil down to the general idea that a college education is a good thing; or, at any rate, the thing to do.

What kind of a boy can the college expect to obtain from a home like this? Much can be said in his favor. His manners are good, so long as their demands are not in opposition to self-interest; he is gentlemanly, except when the mob spirit is at work; he is clean, cheerful, something of the man of the world, ready to admit his own failings but without much ambition to correct them; he is resourceful and energetic in things in which his interest lies. If the motto of William of Wyckham, set up for

the old foundation of Winchester, "Manners makyth man," be interpreted in a narrow sense, he is admirable material on which to work. But the primary purpose of the college has been defined as the training of the intellect. How is he prepared for such training? To what extent has he been exposed in his home to the contagion of the high things of the intellectual world, not in the form of direct teaching, but in that of daily familiarity and use? What are the books which he may casually pick up from the library table? What is the tone of the every-day conversation which goes on in the home? Are the high thoughts of the past, the great figures of history, the pressing problems of the present, matters which are ever mentioned? Are they treated not as things to be learned as lessons, but as obvious parts of the equipment of the intelligent man? It is feared that in many cases the answers to these questions cannot be satisfactory.

A parent, to whose attention complaints of this kind have recently come, asked with some irritation whether he was expected to read little John to sleep from the works of Shakespeare: little John who was eighteen years old, six feet tall, who smoked a pipe, played football, and shaved every day. It is to be feared that John would profit little by such treatment, however good it might be for father. But if Shakespeare and other great figures of the past had been ordinary figures in the family conversation during John's childhood—not dragged in with didactic purpose, but occurring naturally from the parents' familiarity with the best thoughts of all time—; if John had ever heard Shakespeare mentioned save in the horrible "required readings" of his preparatory school, he might have come to college with the knowledge that Shakespeare was not a contemporary of Sophocles, and that, as a writer of entertaining plays, he need not fear comparison even with the talented Mr. George M. Cohan: and still little John might be six feet tall, smoke a pipe, play football, and shave every day.

Contagion by contact with things intellectual in early years is the best preparation for the intellectual development which is the purpose of the college. It does not always "take," but it usually does if given a fair chance. Didactic training in the home is out of place, save as it is applied to curiosity already aroused. We are all familiar with the child of cultivated parents who cheerfully refuses to interest himself in things of the intellect, who remains immune to suggestion to higher thoughts than those

associated with the every-day work of life. Often this is the result of forcing the issue. The parent may be the most depressing of all persons, sadder even than the "tired business man" described above; the individual who dwells perpetually in the thin air of the higher realms; who refuses to descend at all to the cheerful trivialities of the day; who knows not Babe Ruth; who rejects Arthur Guiterman because he does not write like Milton; who is impatient with the chorus of Ziegfeld because it differs from the chorus of Aristophanes. But such individuals are not so common as to constitute a serious problem in American life.

It is said that we are a new civilization; that time enough has not elapsed for the cultural tradition to have established itself on American soil. That is probably true, but the situation would be more encouraging if the beginnings of that development could more plainly be observed. Many graduates of our colleges have formed and are forming such homes; more than we like to confess add little to the intellectual level of American life. The increase in the number of educated women, women who find their work in the forming and shaping of the intellectual lives of their children, is hopeful; if only the tendency to extremes and to fads, sometimes there observed, is not carried too far. However that may be, at present the college cannot be sure that the intellectual background of its students, even those coming from the more prosperous classes of the community, is what might be desired, or even what might be expected. The difficulties of its task are increased thereby.

The Discipline of the Home

The intellectual background of the home is not all that must be considered. What of its discipline; what of the conditions under which the child is reared?

Here again the creed of our fathers was simple and direct. The authority on child rearing was Solomon; by biblical repute the wisest man of all time; and moreover an individual who had exceptional opportunities for the study of children in his own home. "He that spareth the rod hateth his son, but he that loveth him chasteneth him betimes," put by Butler in Hudibras into the more quotable form "spare the rod and spoil the child" was the principle followed as a rule almost religious in its origin; quite regardless of the fact that the effect of the rod was more

often to relieve the irritation of the parent than to promote the welfare of the child.

All that has now changed. The study of the child and of the conditions under which he best can develop has become professionalized. Individuals devote their lives to the development of the principles of child training and, as a result, produce ponderous tomes for the guidance of the parent. Appeal to reason and the preservation at all odds of the individuality of the child are the guiding principles. No one can criticise those principles in the abstract, but in the hands of some parents and applied to some children the results are disastrous. The trouble is that a given method applied to different children never produces exactly the same effect. Little John and little Arthur overflow the bath tub with water and admire the pretty cascade which results. Of course they should not be scolded; it is natural for children to admire running water. So the power of reason is used. Little John responds readily and tearfully to the appeal; to the picture of desolation and havoc of floors and ceiling; to the financial loss to poor papa, who has to work so hard; to the weary toil of plasterers and paper hangers who must repair the damage. But little Arthur, less sympathetic but with singularly acute powers of reason, feels in his own mind that warped floors are rather more interesting than perfectly flat ones; that in the discolored ceilings fascinating pictures may be traced; that poor papa still seems able to provide all that he, little Arthur, can require; and that plasterers and paper hangers are willing to pause in their arduous labors to let him play with unfamiliar tools and to give him a perfectly wonderful day. So he resolves to repeat the process at the earliest possible moment.

The modern principles of child training, well reasoned and valid as they are, when blindly followed by parents lacking in common sense, result in a product horrible to contemplate. Self-centered, undisciplined, pert, seldom subject to healthy restraint, almost malicious in mischief; such children are regarded by everyone but their parents as a pest in the community. As they grow to early manhood and womanhood, tragedies sometimes develop, examples of which are familiar to all; tragedies to be traced directly to the foolishly undisciplined character of the early training.

Of course in the long run these defects are in a measure corrected. The moment that anyone makes demands upon the

community, the moment the individual must work with others for his self-support, he finds that the community demands of him a certain amount of suppression of his individuality for the benefit of all; a certain conformity to established custom and tradition which is necessary to make effective the working of society as a whole. Just as the docile individual, too much repressed in youth, finds a reasonable amount of self-assertion necessary for his existence; so the bumptious conceit of the self-centered egotist must in a measure disappear, if his share in the work of the day is to be done at all. This readjustment is one of the great shocks of life, and the greater it must be, the more trying is its effect upon the individual and the more difficult it is to accomplish. That is what makes the decade from twenty to thirty a time of particular stress in the development of the man.

The period of college life comes before, or perhaps begins, this period of readjustment. It is true that the contacts of college do much to remove the disagreeable externals of the self-centered boy. But it may be questioned whether the institution is equally successful in attacking the essential difficulty; in getting at the fundamentally false motives of the youth. At all events the central purpose of the institution, to arouse and stimulate intellectual curiosity, is hampered so far as the college must deal with an individual who has never been aroused to the necessity of work, and in whom self-indulgence has always been given full sway.

Together with the problem of the discipline of the child in the home comes that of the over-supply of money. The American father, in the attempt to do the best he possibly can for his boy, is apt to become foolishly indulgent in this respect, as in others. The result is most unfortunate. Without proper training in the expenditure of money; every whim met by an immediate response; with no appreciation of what the earning of money means; any youth is well on the way to being spoiled. If he has serious interests, if he attends college with a serious purpose, he is to be congratulated in overcoming handicaps which seem overwhelming. It is not alone the effect on the boy himself that is disheartening; the influence on the college as a whole is still worse. The distinction between rich and poor becomes more marked. The general scale of expenditure increases. Motor cars, and irresponsible drivers of them, become a problem. Tradesmen, with tales of "imported" and "exclusive" goods, battening on the

ignorance and gullibility of boys untrained in the use of the money which they have not earned, wax fat. Even large incomes are insufficient for the strain. The money lender is not unknown, and finance may resolve itself in the mind of the student into methods ranging from petty chicanery to direct fraud to get from home an increase of an allowance already more than ample. With it goes a financial laxity and want of responsibility which makes commonplace in the community of the college methods and practices which would not for a moment be tolerated in the community at large. It would be misleading to believe that this picture is true of the college as a whole; it is too likely to be true of those members of it whose parents are unduly generous in their supply of money, but who have never taken the trouble to train their sons in the proper spending of it. With men of this type, with the glamor of money and the things which money will buy ever before their eyes, what is the chance of the true purpose of the college, the training of the intellect, to become a predominant motive?

The ambition of a country boy is aroused by the picture of college training. He is poor; he must rely upon himself. He works his way through the country academy by hard manual toil. He enters college with the same problem before him, and solves it in the same way. He knows that he has missed many of the pleasant experiences of college life, but he values that which he has obtained because he knows what it has cost. He is graduated and becomes successful and prosperous in his chosen calling. He determines that his own boy shall never lack the things which he himself has missed. The boy is given his own way, he is seldom required to do the thing that is irksome, his individuality is carefully preserved, money is his at demand, he has everything except the sympathetic guidance and control of his father. He enters college and makes a lamentable and disgraceful failure of his opportunities. The father descends on the college authorities with glowing indignation, and accuses the institution of causing the ruin of his son. Whose is the fault?

The School

One whose work is college teaching should be wary of criticizing the system and results of the schools beneath. His own institution is so much the subject of just attack that the advice

concerning the ocular mote and beam is sure to be cited in reply. Moreover, the study of the pedagogical principles which govern the conduct of the lower schools has been carried far, and with the results attained the college teacher is likely to be profoundly ignorant. Nevertheless, without some consideration of the effect of school training on the material which the college must shape, a discussion of the difficulties which the institution must face would be incomplete. With hesitation, and with full understanding that they cover only a relatively superficial view of the situation, the suggestions below are offered.

In the early days the requirements of the school were fairly simple, and simply met. Of course, like all public institutions, it was from the first the subject of criticism; mostly, in those days as now, to the effect that it was neglecting fundamentals for ornamental trappings of no value to its pupils. The secondary school was generally a private institution, with college preparation as its main aim. As such its course also was relatively simple, and if some of its methods strike us with horror, certain definitely useful results came from them. Even that most stupid of all educational methods, the learning by rote of whole sections of the Latin grammar, is looked back upon by some of those who were subjected to the process as having been of material benefit to them in their subsequent careers; not as Latin grammar, but as a tough job well done.

I suspect that the complaints of those who are critical of our system of public schools would most generally be found to center around this point; that today there are too few "tough jobs well done." In the study and application of pedagogy; in the development of principles of education; in the formulation of the methods of teaching and in the training of teachers; in the arrangement of curricula; in the endeavor to secure educational uniformity within statewide limits; in the extension of the educational system so that it fits the needs of all classes of boys and girls; in all this devoted and pains-taking work which has been so fruitful in improving educational conditions within our schools, have we kept in mind the necessity of forming in the child the habit of attacking boldly a task to be done, and of carrying it through with resolution?

Of course the answer is made that no one should be compelled to do a tough job unless he can be convinced that it is worth doing, or perhaps even, unless it would interest him to do it.

It is surely a good thing to know that what one does is of value; it is agreeable to feel interest in what one undertakes; but a principle which will lead to the belief—as this inevitably will—that one should not be compelled to do a tough job because it is a tough job will never have the highest success. After all some tasks confront us in life the value of which we do not see, and many there are which do not interest us, but nevertheless they must be done. Despite the opinions of educational experts to the contrary he who as a child has attained the power of meeting the tasks of a child with courage and resolution, will as a man find the tasks of a man less an obstacle in his way.

The kindergarten is an admirable part of our school system. The child, through directed but natural play, has his interest aroused to things worth knowing and learns, quite unconscious of the fact that he is learning. But if the principle of the kindergarten is extended to the grades, to the secondary school, to the college, there will result in the product of these institutions a lack of mental fibre, sad to contemplate. Interest is admirable in awaking intellectual activity; its lifting power in the college is too much neglected; but is it over-valued in the schools? Is it taken for granted that a subject must be interesting to be of value; that a teacher must at all times and all places be interesting to be a good teacher? That may not be the logical result of the pedagogical theories in general, but the college teacher who studies the mental attitude of his class of entering freshmen is inclined to believe that it is. As it is put by Dean Briggs:

"We now speak of the barrenness of memory work. We wobble all over the flowery meadows. We have boys who cannot spell, teachers who cannot spell, teachers of English who cannot spell, college professors who cannot spell and who have a mean opinion of spelling. In practical life the job has to be done and the man has to adapt himself to do it or lose it, and in practical life everyone but the trained man is going to have a hard time. Education should first and foremost train, and training has for its very substance the overcoming of obstacles. Dr. Martineau gave double time to the subjects he disliked. This, he admits, is too ascetic, yet better on the whole than the emasculate extreme of doing nothing but what one likes to do, so prevalent today. Power to drudge at the distasteful task he considers a test of faculty. Today the student virtually comes to the professor with a bill of rights in his hands and says, 'Mind you must not be dull or I will go to sleep; you must attract me or I shall not get on; you must rivet my attention or my thoughts

will wander.' Such students have become so reduced that they would like, as it were, to lie in bed and have their studies brought up to them."

No one would accuse the school of entire responsibility for this condition. But it may be doubted if either school or college is doing all that it should to counteract it.

The difficulty tends to be increased by the nature of the school curriculum. When a child of ten brings to his parent a report of his work which embodies marks in thirteen distinct subjects, that parent is justified in forming the suspicion that no one of these subjects can be done very well. Even when the explanation is made that some of them are graded as a result of work done in others, and that the main attention is put upon a few, his suspicion still remains that with such diversity of interest the attention of both pupil and teacher must be so scattered as to lose much of its force. Even if this is not true, the very task of bookkeeping must leave for the teacher little strength for anything else. Are we as a nation given in our whole educational system to snippets and half issues; to many things started but few things well done? Theories, good in themselves, seem sometimes to be applied without common sense. Foreign languages are most easily learned in youth; so we introduce French in the grades; taught in two or three half-hour periods per week; taught by formal instruction from text books; taught by teachers whose command of French is slight; taught, many times, to pupils who cannot spell, cannot employ the fundamentals of arithmetic correctly, cannot read, even, with emphasis and intelligence.

The school has justly protested against the tyranny of the college in its rigid requirements of subjects for entrance, and has properly gained in the matter a larger measure of freedom. But it does not seem beyond the realm of possibility that if the school were to be the only judge of what proper preparation should be, the college would receive from some schools students entering with fifteen different units, selected from those subjects which seem to be the easiest. In fact, the presence of Latin in the curriculum of the High School is the saving grace of the situation. A measure of indulgence will, I think, be granted to a teacher of chemistry by his classical colleagues if he greets with a certain ribald mirth some of their claims of results which come from the study of Latin. But it is clear to most people, even to chemists,

that the study of Latin gives four years of thorough training, calling for mental concentration and effort; that it is a "tough job" and that it is within the capacity of the school to see that it is "well done"; and that it is almost the only subject remaining in the high school curriculum of which that can be said. The greater success in college work which, as a class, those students who enter with the classical training achieve over those who do not have it, is to be attributed not so much to the nature of the subject as to the fact that it has presented a task which has required concentration and hard effort for its solution. So other hard tasks are attacked with less mental shrinking and are carried through with more resolution.

President Butler says:

"The elementary school must be rescued from the faddist and the enthusiast who use it not for education, but for their own ends. The secondary school and the college have abdicated their place as leaders in modern life and have become the plaything of whatever temporary and passing influence may operate upon them. Teachers are not teachers at all, but propagandists. It is to these conditions that the ineffectiveness of modern education is due."

In line with this protest a member of the school board in a New England city gravely proposed that the board should institute a "school studies day"; one day in which nothing but the work of the school should be done; in which the teacher, as such, was to hold the floor, and all wild-eyed enthusiasts, however noble their cause and good their pleas, were to be shown the door.

Other points might be discussed; the development of social activities and athletics at the expense of intellectual training; the feminization of the teaching of boys; the excessive control and standardization of methods of teaching from above; the influence of the whims of a public uninformed as to education upon an institution for which it pays the bills. Some of these and other like conditions are out of the control of the school itself; in some cases, perhaps, it does not sufficiently resist their influence. But the result, so far as it affects the college, is the accentuation of the difficulties which have been outlined above.

What has been said is intended to apply to the public school. The private secondary schools, with liberty to follow methods of their own, and, in most cases, with the single end of college

preparation in view, should be able to fulfill this purpose with a high degree of efficiency. The best of them are admirable institutions and do their work thoroughly and well. Unfortunately the effect of their training is largely neutralized by the fact that their graduates, to a greater extent than those of the public schools, come from families in which the handicaps discussed in the earlier part of this chapter are at their maximum. It seems to be a fact that these handicaps so operate in the relative freedom of college life as to make the graduates of the private schools as a class perform the intellectual work of the college less well than their more poorly prepared rivals.

If, therefore, the validity of our thesis is admitted, we come to the conclusion that, speaking generally, the college labors under this handicap; that the students who come to it are not sufficiently trained by the schools below in boldness in facing intellectual problems, and in habits of industry and concentration, to enter as profitably as they might on the later stage of their educational careers.

* * * *

One might gather from this discussion that the average student entering college is a youth who comes from a home with no intellectual background; that he has been pampered and spoiled; that he is unreasonably well furnished with money, and has never been taught to use it properly; and that he has brought nothing from his school of value in his college career. The wild absurdity of such a picture is self-evident. The boy who unites in himself all these undesirable qualities is rare; although perhaps much in the public eye from the spectacular nature of his college life, and the pyrotechnics of his exit from the institution. On the other hand the boys are many who come from homes of culture; who have been trained wisely and sympathetically; who have been taught responsibility in the use of money; and whose school experience has been such as to afford a proper foundation for what the college has to offer. Between the two are all gradations; and the problems which the college has to meet can be studied effectively and solved in a satisfactory way only if the deficiencies, which must be expected in many of the students who enter, are kept properly in mind.

Chapter VI

HANDICAPS UNDER WHICH THE COLLEGE LABORS

II. *Social Life. "Activities" and Fraternities*

THE college boy is a normal individual and brings with him the normal social impulses of his kind. Moreover he is an American youth and so brings those social habits and customs which have developed in our civilization. No one expects or desires the college student to become a social recluse, all of whose interests are centered on things of the intellect: or, if anyone does expect and desire it, his disappointment is going to be profound. Nevertheless it is a problem of the college to be on its guard lest the intellectual purpose of the institution be completely submerged in the sea of social activity.

As to social life, in its ordinary sense, the problem presented to each institution differs: with the nature of the college; with the class from which its clientele is drawn; with its geographical position. The co-educational institution—in particular the state university—is confronted just now, in a peculiarly acute way, with those problems which come from the presence of boys and girls in the same college. The modern development of social life—over development we may almost say—finds its reflection in the college, and the authorities are becoming worried by its tendency to drive out everything else. The frequent and evidently heartfelt congratulations extended by such teachers to those whose work is in a college for men alone come, not from a general and serious condemnation of the principle of co-education, but from a temporary irritation at the accentuation of the peculiar problems with which the co-educational institution is confronted. In colleges for men—particularly in those remote from large centers—social activity is likely to be sporadic, but so intense while it lasts that everything else is swept out of the way. Moreover it may bring in its train excesses of a particularly exasperating nature, which are not only bad in themselves, but which, from the embarrassing and unfair publicity resulting from them, impair the prestige of an institution whose purpose is supposed to be educational.

Not all of them social in their nature, but best treated at this point, are the various "activities" whose increase and development in recent years strike the observer with wonder. The American passion for organization is given full play. Whenever a congenial group gathers for the discussion of some matter of common interest, there is likely to follow the formation of a society or club, fully provided with the usual paraphernalia of officers and dues; and with particular care that the organization is duly blazoned forth on the pages of the college annual. In fact, the unkind observer is likely to say that the principal purpose of many of these societies is the publicity which they bring to their members. Even if this were so, it reflects a spirit not unknown to the world outside. Dr. Fitch's observation that "though the undergraduate would rather die than confess it, what he most and really wants is popularity" would be more illuminating if it did not pretty generally apply to the human race at large.

After all, these organizations, taken as a whole, must be reckoned among the great assets of the college. Many of them are intellectual in their purpose; those which are not usually have a purpose well worth the attainment. They give outlet to the enthusiasms of youth, and they turn into really useful directions energies which might otherwise be wasted. Many of them give a training, perhaps different from that afforded by the college, but equally valuable in its results. Others supplement its work in direction in which the institution as such does not enter. The energy which the college boys devote to the "activity" in which they are interested is a patent proof that, as a class, they are not properly subject to the accusation often brought against them, that of laziness. No one who observes the matter carefully would wish the college to be without the influence which these organizations afford.

Of course the tendency to excess, in things good as well as bad, brings its penalty. If in the case of a boy of previously good academic record, who nearly wrecks his college course by his devotion to the interests of a college periodical, the claim is made that the benefits of such work are perhaps greater than those which he would have obtained from his regular courses, the father is quite justified in the retort that, while the statement may be true, those were not the benefits for which he was paying. The question is not one of absolute but of relative values. The

essential purpose of the institution must ever be kept in mind. No college should discourage the development of these valuable side issues. But, on the other hand, no college should yield its primary purpose to them; no college, even, should make the attainment of that purpose so easy that the principal attention of the student may be devoted to them. They are side issues, after all.

It is easy to arrive at these correct, if somewhat platitudinous, principles. How they are to be put into effect is another matter. The method of compulsion is unattractive; the method of student co-operation has its charms. The trouble is that the generation of students is always changing; that the relative wisdom of the experienced senior is continually being diluted by the volatile and self-centered sophomore and the boyish freshman. Just how far the student body as a whole properly views the question in its wide aspects is doubtful. Some measure of repression, particularly in social matters, will probably always be necessary. Aside from this, the problem is not essentially different from that presented by athletics; and suggestions as to the most promising ways of handling it may be deferred to the discussion in that section.

Fraternities

No consideration of the social side issues of the American college can be complete without reference to that peculiarly American institution; the fraternity. Organized with the object equally of promoting good fellowship and of stimulating the intellectual life, it has, in its development, sloughed off for the most part the second of these purposes, and is now centering its attention almost entirely on the first.

College fraternities have never been free from attack, but the direction of the attack has often been at points at which they are not particularly vulnerable. It is often urged that they are undemocratic. In some states, even, legislative action has at times been urged against them—so far as they exist in the state universities—on this ground. The best answer to this complaint is that in the narrow sense of democracy it is probably true. But if, in devotion to democracy, it must come about that every institution open to one must be open to all; that equality means that all must go through exactly the same

mill; then democracy will soon fall of its own weight. Of course some results are painful. The freshman who, returning home for his first vacation, must reveal to the coldly appraising eyes of the girl in whom he is interested the absence of the mystic pledge button, for the time regards the experience as deeply humiliating. It may even engender in him a feeling of inferiority which is of permanent harm. But almost always the boy rises to a sane view of the real importance of the matter, and may even be benefited by the experience. Nor need the "secret" nature of the organization be a cause of worry. Of course the observer who is nothing if not coolly philosophic and aloof may jibe at the mystic letters, at the solemn ritual, at the esoteric meaning of the badge, and at all the hidden significance of things not worth the knowing. He may regard the fraternity merely as a higher manifestation of the spirit which animates the negro in his voodoo worship and in his order of "Sons of I Will Arise." But excessively detached and too coolly philosophic observers are rather of a nuisance at the best, and fortunately have little influence. It is the fact that the secret order makes a striking appeal to the American mind, that they are usually harmless and sometimes useful. There is no reason to expect that the college should be free from this appeal.

There are good reasons why the fraternity has developed; why its position today is stronger than ever. Its advantages are many. There is the good fellowship among its members which makes the fraternity life in college a pleasant memory ever after. There is the sense of solidarity, the obligation to work with others for a common purpose; of value to any man. There is the necessity of individual subordination to the welfare of the unit; of putting aside whims and inclinations which conflict with the common good. There is the sense of pride in being a part of a great organization, nation-wide in its scope. There is the companionship and close intimacy with congenial men which makes the fraternity friendships of college the closest friendships of life. No wonder that many a man looks back upon the fraternity associations of his college days as among the choicest experiences of his life, and places loyalty to the organization high among the obligations which are his.

So the fraternity has gained in the college a place which it cannot lose. Aside from merely vested rights; from its ownership of property, and long acceptance of the organization as a

part of the institution; it does a work which must be done. If the fraternity were abolished some organization not essentially different would have to be created to fill the place which it would leave.

None the less, if the workings of the fraternity system be examined, coolly and without prejudice, it seems clear that they leave much to be desired in their effect on the fundamental purpose of the college. Let us see if this statement can be justified.

In Chapter III of this report the attempt was made to sum up some of the difficulties under which the man of scholastic tastes must labor; to show the extreme test which he must undergo to prove that he is not a pedant. The one place at which this feeling most plainly centers and can be most clearly observed is in the fraternity. What are the qualities which most chapters think desirable in men whom they are considering for admission? Of course athletic ability is a sure key to the sacred portal. It may be that in some college at some time a man of marked athletic prowess, but with no other pleasant human traits, was extended an invitation by no fraternity in the institution, but I have not heard of such a case. Wealth, more and more, is being regarded as an asset. In these days houses and furniture and fraternity festivities are increasingly expensive, and the man with a well lined pocket and a liberal disposition is a person whose claims are not to be regarded lightly: although, to their credit be it said, fraternities are less subservient in this respect than is the world outside. Next the man with some special talent, which bids fair to bring college prestige, is looked for. After these classes are secured, in the great body of men to be considered, they win most favor who are "normal"; normal in dress, in manner, in personality, in mental outlook; men who conform to established code; men, in other words, whose recommendation is their mediocrity. But what of scholarship? Fraternities are glad to obtain the high-stand student, if they are sure that in every other respect the individual conforms to type; but the case must be so clear and self-evident as to be established only with difficulty. Of course it is a libel to say that scholarship is a definite obstacle to the man with fraternity ambitions, but it is a libel that is likely to be uttered by the teacher of many freshmen, who, on the morning when the lists of fraternity pledges are published, computes the proportion of men of high stand who are thus pledged; and then does the same for the men of the

lowest grade. He may even be tempted to go farther and to assert that absolute stupidity is no bar to fraternity consideration. Nor is his opinion as to the merits of the case modified when, disregarding his academic robes, and only considering himself as a man with the need of human companionship, he asks how many of these high stand men he would pick as friends for himself.

Of course it is said that questions of intellectual status should not enter into the selection of a fraternity group; the test is one of congeniality. This would be a perfectly defensible position were it the real one. But what are the facts? The central ambition of the fraternity is leadership and the prestige which comes therefrom. Practically every one of them will gladly welcome men with little in common with others of the group, provided that there is a reasonable surety that these men will obtain positions of influence in the life of the college. Listen to the speeches of the initiation banquet. The older men impress upon the neophytes the idea that the leadership of Gamma Gamma with all its responsibility is soon to devolve upon them; that they must so prepare and assert themselves that there will be no decline in its present high position. The freshmen solemnly accept the responsibility, and pledge themselves to "go out for something" at once that time may not be lost. Listen in the house to the earnest plea of the brothers to a backsliding freshman who has suddenly decided to put his time on mathematics (although already he has a C average) rather than to roll the athletic field as a heeler; because he likes the mathematics better. Smith comes in with the announcement that he has won the Greek prize. The congratulations are hearty, although rather puzzled; and the group turns with real joy to Brown who put the shot an inch further than he did yesterday. And all soon set themselves with enthusiasm to the task of planning a deal with Chi Alpha and Xi Xi whereby there is good chance that Robinson will be elected assistant manager of the Mah Jong team.

The picture is a caricature, but a caricature with truth behind it. Leadership, prestige, are the continual aims of the fraternity: success in securing undergraduate honors so that it may attract the kind of men from the freshmen who will, in turn, secure these honors and thus carry on the fraternity leadership. But what has all this to do with a congenial undergraduate group?

Why should any man be urged to engage in activities for the sake of Gamma Gamma unless he finds pleasure and profit in doing it for himself?

Scholarship, unfortunately, is not regarded as an activity. Most fraternities are extremely anxious for a sufficient display of scholarly activity on the part of their members to keep them in college. Brothers *ex urbe* are not much of an asset. Most of the chapters are pleased, and somewhat dazed, at finding high stand men among them. Position at the head of the scholarship list, as at the head of anything, is hailed with real joy; it is used by the fraternity holding it as an argument in its favor in chinning; and by all the others as showing that the group in question is composed of "grinds" and is thereby to be avoided. Those in the middle of the list consider that a gentlemanly position; while those at the bottom are a bit shame faced, although the persistence of certain organizations in this position year after year indicates either that they are not entirely dissatisfied with that place, or that, in their superhuman efforts to rise, their luck has been uncommonly bad. No one except the college authorities seems to worry over the fact that the scholarship rank of fraternity men as a whole is always below that of the non-fraternity men. In general the college can count on little real interest in things intellectual on the part of the fraternities; and it can always count on conditions being such in some fraternities as actively to discourage it. And the prestige of the fraternity and of fraternity membership in the minds of the undergraduates is such as to make peculiarly effective its attitude toward scholarship on the whole tone of the institution.

A splendid opportunity is open to the fraternity to serve as a center for discussions; to bring together in the fraternity house men of varied tastes and varied opportunities, who by their daily contact and conversation shall work upon and shape each other: to serve the purpose, in some measure, that the Oxford college is supposed to serve in the life of that institution. It is true that discussion—even discussion of serious things—is not absent from the life of the fraternity. The "leagues" which are common enough serve a most useful purpose; although one who listens to them is tempted to conclude that, as in the world outside, the man with the loudest voice, the greatest self-confidence, and the least knowledge of the subject under discussion

is likely to hold the floor. There is perhaps too little respect for the man who knows, and too great a desire to keep the discussion on a plane in which fine spun theory is removed from the danger of puncture by inconvenient fact. But we should not be too critical of any sort of a discussion of things worth while. More serious is the undue tendency to confine conversation to the trivial and jocular; matters well enough in themselves, and which constitute the savor without which social intercourse becomes heavy and dull, but which, if over done, make conversation empty and vain. Moreover if fraternity grouping makes possible the greater development of what is good, it gives equal opportunity to that which is bad. Every faculty member, whose duty it is to keep a guiding eye on his chapter, knows how easy it is for things highly undesirable to make their way into the organization, and with what rapidity they develop. One who observes the long series of rules which are supposed to govern inter-fraternity relations; how short a time they last, and how quickly they are replaced by others equally cumbersome; the suspicion with which the conduct of each chapter is regarded by the others; the constant complaints of chicanery or of more or less open disregard of the spirit of principles set up for common guidance; knows how difficult it is to maintain the moral tone of the institution as a whole on a plane nearly as high as that which controls the individual action of its members.

It is not that the fraternity is the cause of these evils. They come, rather, from the tone of the social order from which the student springs. The fraternity merely serves as a mechanism to bring them to a focus; to make their effects so visible that all can see. To destroy the institution would be vain; it would be replaced by something not essentially different. Many of the evils which we might expect to develop may be checked, and are checked in the better colleges, by the authorities of the institution; many of them are repressed by the wise control of the fraternities themselves. But we may nevertheless reconcile ourselves to the fact that, so long as the fraternities remain as they are, so long as the men who enter them bring them qualities which they now do, the institution, in its effect on the life of the undergraduate, constitutes a most serious handicap to the college in the accomplishment of its intellectual purpose.

Chapter VII

HANDICAPS UNDER WHICH THE COLLEGE LABORS

III. Athletics

NO subject connected with the college presents such difficulties as does the problem of athletics. In nothing else are opinions so extreme, so animated, and so diverse. On the one hand we have the alumnus who, though he would never admit it, has athletics always in mind when he thinks of alma mater: the student whose one ambition is success in athletic endeavor; the faculty member whose sincere appreciation of what is good in athletics makes him a bit blind to what is bad; that portion of the public at large who know of the existence of a given college only from its appearance in the sporting pages of the newspaper, and who judge its success entirely by its athletic prestige. On the other hand we have members of all these groups—even of the student group, and in increasing numbers—who regard the modern development of athletics as a monstrous and deadly excrescence on the educational system, and would extirpate it, root and branch, if they had their way.

If a detached observer surveys the course of athletics in our colleges, from their origin not much more than fifty years ago to their flourishing state at present, his credulity is tested to the utmost to believe that a development so extraordinary could have been reached in so short a time. Athletics had a normal start from the crude games of the college campus. Those who prided themselves on their prowess and skill found it amusing and interesting to visit other colleges near at hand, and to compare notes on the matter. They went at their own expense, they provided their own paraphernalia, they bought their own uniforms (unless, perchance, the ordinary "tall" hat and black coat of the time were considered uniform enough), their whiskers waved luxuriantly in the wind, and they had good fun from the experience. Nobody paid much attention to them at first; nobody escorted them to the train or met them on their return; nobody had the idea that they were "doing something for the college." But this could not last. American ideas of rivalry and

the American passion for organized efficiency soon took the situation in hand. The development of the American variant of football, with its spectacular appeal to the mass, that form of sport against which most of the attacks on college athletics really center, had its effect on the situation. Soon, quite unconscious of its rapid growth, we found ourselves in the midst of the athletic regime which still takes our breath away.

We cannot be surprised at the astonishment of the foreign observer who views the status of athletics in our colleges, and at his bewilderment in the attempt to account for its place in an institution supposed to be educational. We are bewildered ourselves when we coolly try to do it. We have gone on the principle that what is worth doing at all is worth doing well. As a result we have provided the most careful and painstaking and time-consuming instruction for the members of our teams. We obtain an army of coaches: we pay them, in many institutions, the most grossly exaggerated salaries; salaries warranted only by the law of supply and demand, and quite unwarranted by that law when we consider that practically all the demand is from the colleges themselves and under their control. Sometimes we are too much concerned with the efficiency of these coaches in bringing victory, and not enough concerned with the ethics by which victory is brought. We think that if a few sports are good, many sports are better; and so manifold forms of organized activity are added to the list. We find that this costs money and requires equipment; so imposing stadia and fields and club houses are provided; many managers are engaged, and budgets are arranged. A great business organization is built up, of which no one, a generation ago, could have dreamed. To provide for this huge outlay, concessions of principle must be made by some institutions whose geographical position is unfortunate; schedules must be arranged with financial considerations mainly in view, and which involve conditions which even those who arrange them deem undesirable. An intricate system of inter-collegiate relations has grown up, the demands of which have developed, on the part of those engaged in the negotiations, qualities of diplomacy which Metternich himself would not have disdained. The pressing demands of importunate groups of alumni, always most strongly urgent in athletic matters, must be satisfied; or if the demands as such cannot be satisfied, at any rate the group must be appeased. Some colleges, seeing a great light, provide themselves with hired

athletes at the sacrifice not only of all academic standards, but even of all standards of decency, and fondly imagine that, by winning athletic success, they rise in repute as institutions of education. Suspicions of motives or of sincerity of purpose are not uncommon as each institution surveys its rivals. The athlete himself is the hero; all the honors of the undergraduate world are his; in some places his path is made easy by methods which are perfectly legitimate, in others by methods which are quite the opposite; in addition to the prestige which, of itself, would make any man submit to the weary grind of training for its attainment, he is held up to the world as one who has "done much for his college." The college, at times, lives in the glamor of athletic enthusiasm; all things are colored by the approaching contest; if interest wanes it is whipped up by the mass meeting with its frenzied appeals to "support the team"; and, at the end, the undue elation at victory or the undue depression at defeat are likely to produce results not strikingly different. No wonder that our foreign observer retires, deeply dazed, to reflect on what all this has to do with an institution whose primary purpose is the training of the intellect.

These statements in regard to athletics are very easy to make; they are all very true; and they are quite worthless, if they are taken by themselves. It is not difficult to observe surface symptoms; but such observation does not amount to much unless it leads to the discovery of the underlying cause. When college athletics are thus subjected to test, that cause is not hard to make out. It is no other than that which we have found to account for other difficulties of the college: the background of American life; those things which the boy brings with him as a result of his eighteen years' experience with the world in which he has lived.

The normal American boy is a sport-loving being. Any father finds very early that he has no difficulty in arousing his son's interest in Rogers Hornsby, but if he attempts to awaken equal enthusiasm for Roger Bacon, his success is not great. Later on, if the college does its duty, the youth will come to know that the latter, too, had his good points, but he will not thereby forget the former. In other words interest in sport, although then easily aroused, is not confined to youth; it is a normal interest of the American man; an interest which, in some form or other, is likely to persist through life. Nor does it necessarily mean that

the sport-loving individual must participate in athletic contests. If his physique is at all equal to the demand, he will do so; but the pale anaemic youth, who throws like a girl, upon investigation, may be found to keep the batting averages of all the players in the league, and to know rather more about the game than the husky brute who earns a princely salary by his skill in knocking the ball into the next field. As participant or as spectator, most of us have some interest in sport; an interest which, among others, marks out our civilization from any other, save that of England.

Another American trait is organization, and so we proceed to organize our sport. Of course there is always money to be gained by providing the public with what it wants; so we have the development of professional sport, with its splendid equipment, its enormous salaries, its great revenues. Amateur sport is organized no less thoroughly; its machinery works smoothly and effectively. Then comes the question of publicity; which in the business of sport, unlike any other business, solves itself automatically. The newspapers make no demands for advertising revenue; they jostle each other to supply what the public wants to read. The sporting editor, the sporting page, the sporting extra, the special writer, the photographer all respond to the demand. So the inhabitant of Canaan, Vermont, who has never been twenty miles from his native town may—and often does—know as much of the big league as if he spent every afternoon at the Polo Grounds, and feel as well acquainted with the star Cornell half back as though his home were Ithaca, N. Y.

The colleges, unfortunately, have their full share of this athletic publicity. The sporting editor is a well intentioned individual, and he would undoubtedly remonstrate with surprise if he were singled out for attack as a most potent source of harm to the college in its attempts to keep athletics on a respectable basis. But nevertheless that statement comes reasonably near the truth; or, rather, the forces behind him make him a source of such harm. For in essence the editor, though a devotee of sport, is in sport for business: and the business view of the situation is that for the side that won, no further explanation is necessary; while for the side that lost, none can be effective. The coach who subordinates to winning everything including the ordinary rules of decency, but who takes care that such violation of ethics is not too visible; who, in short, is a thoroughly bad influence in the college community—and who wins—is fulsomely extolled to

the skies, while the one who plays the game straight and loses is dismissed with a few kind words. The college which does its best to keep its athletic standards high, and the college which, with open purse, scours the country for husky men, be their other qualifications what they may, are judged by the same rule—did it win or did it lose. But publicity, such as it is, is there. The public is interested in the athletic doings of the colleges and is given what it wants, in full measure and running over. And the boy, who like many an older and wiser man turns first to the athletic page of his newspaper, finds there his news from the college of his choice, while elsewhere he often looks in vain for any reference to it.

Thus the normal boy lives from his earliest youth in a world in the life of which sport plays a leading part. He is surrounded by an atmosphere of sport in the home, in the school, in all the activities of his daily life. As a normal boy he shares that interest and, in particular, the interest in athletics of the institution of which he expects to become a part. He comes to college at an age at which that interest is at its height. He has learned the history of its athletic glory; he has admired the exploits of its athletic heroes; he looks forward to his share in its sports, as participant or as spectator, as one of the great experiences of his undergraduate days. With the freshman bringing this spirit to the institution; with the undergraduates at an age at which sport has its greatest appeal; with an alumni body upon which the effect persists; with an outside public ever interested in athletic developments; is it any wonder that athletics have attained in the college the place which is now theirs.

Viewing the evils of the situation alone, it is easy enough, particularly for one who has no responsibility in putting his wishes into effect, to demand that organized sport in the college shall be abolished; or, at any rate, be confined to activities that are merely intramural in their extent. It is logical to say that sport is a radical injury to the intellectual purpose of the institution, therefore it must be wiped out. But let us examine the situation as it is, with all aspects of the problem in mind, and always with the standpoint of being able to put into effect what we plan. Viewing the matter in this way, is there anyone who can conclude that there is any reasonable chance of carrying such an abolition, or even limitation, of athletic sports into effect? The vested interests alone, the huge investments in athletic

paraphernalia, the long toleration of the institution until it has grown so great, would make such a solution of the problem difficult. But when one looks at the whole background of American life; the spirit of the world from which the undergraduate comes, to which he returns, and of which he is at all times a part; the hope that any radical change can be made in the spirit of the athletic system must become very faint. The college should lead, it is true; but if its leadership places it so far ahead of those that follow as to make it lose touch with and influence upon them, that leadership is not of much avail. Before athletics can be abolished we must have a public that is prepared for and will support their abolition; before intercollegiate competition is given up we must be sure that it will not be replaced by something worse. The examples of those institutions that have made attempts in that direction do not, by the success of these attempts, encourage us to follow their footsteps.

The case for athletics does not rest alone upon the impracticality of their abolition. Much can be said for their beneficial influence on the college at large. Their evils are open, and plainly to be seen: their excesses are admitted by all: but some of the advantages which they present are not so apparent.

No one can expect that in the community of the college the moral tone of all its members will be entirely and completely admirable. But it is the general testimony of those whose undergraduate days lay in the period prior to the present athletic development, that leisure was much less well spent, and, in particular, that things peculiarly vulgar and nauseating were common; that the whole tone of the institution was lower than it is today. It certainly is true that one who comes across typical publications of the sixties, which in some way have escaped the faculty vigilance of the times, is astonished and digusted both at the point of view set forth and at the vulgarity with which it is expressed. It is quite certain that no undergraduate body would tolerate such a thing today. While athletics may not have been entirely responsible for the change, it is easy to see how they might have had much to do in bringing it about. It is obvious that the athlete must develop self-control, subordination of himself to the welfare of the team as a whole, and at the same time self-reliance in doing his part; in other words he must become a good sport and an efficient one. It is equally obvious that in athletics the attainment of these qualities is peculiarly subject to test; be-

cause if the individual does not develop them he ceases at once to be an athlete—at least, in active service. It is not so obvious that in most sports he must be intelligent. In fact this is contrary to the picture of the "husky brute," which is so general. But in modern games, particularly football, the man who does not size up the situation quickly and act intelligently, usually is more effective in tripping up and putting out of commission all his fellows, than for any other purpose. Moreover this intelligence is trained. The best teaching in college is done by the coach, both on the field and in exercises not essentially different from those of the class room: not because the coach is a good teacher—although commonly he is an excellent one—but because he has a class painfully intent on getting what he has to offer; not sixty per cent of it, but all of it. Again, the product of our athletic training is notably more mature, more poised, more of a man, than are other boys of his age. Further he is, contrary to general opinion, usually quite content to conform to the general rules of the college, with no demand for special favors and privileges. If he asks for them it is an almost sure sign that he has been given bad advice by someone above, who should know better, and is exercising the usual student privilege of "trying anything once." After all, the position of student leadership which comes to him from his athletic reputation is more or less justified by his qualities as a man. The beneficial effect of athletics on the student body at large; on the mass who howl for the team from the bleachers and endlessly discuss its prospects in their rooms, is not so apparent. But the influence of the athlete himself, with the prestige among his fellows which makes that influence potent, must do something to impart to the whole college those qualities which he himself has acquired. Even the great games, with their glamor and their distraction from college work, have something in their favor. It is not a bad thing for a boy to be exposed to the contagion of a great enthusiasm; to experience the thrills of a dramatic contest; to feel himself a living part of a throbbing unit; to form an idea, in some measure, what loyalty and devotion to a common cause may mean. He is not less well prepared thereby for higher loyalties and devotions which may come in after years.

Nor are the palpable evils which have grown up from the athletic situation entirely unrecognized by those who are the best friends of college sport. If one compares the situation today with that twenty years ago, it will be found, in many colleges,

that things have changed notably for the better; with good promise that the process will continue in the years to come. And we have reason for hope that the movement for *clean* sport, which has been so fruitful in many of our colleges, will be so extended by the men whose influence is potent in athletic affairs, that sport *better adapted to the purposes of an educational institution* will be the result.

For after all athletics are a side issue, and as the most popular of side issues, do constitute a most serious handicap to the college in the pursuit of its intellectual purpose. It may be shown that they are so entrenched that their abolition or essential modification is impossible; it may be shown that they have in them so much of good that such action would be undesirable—but a handicap to scholarship none the less they are. On our faculties we have both supporters and opponents of athletics, but at certain times in the college year when the stress of athletics is most pronounced, even the most wildeyed enthusiast unites with the most gloomy pessimist, in the opinion that things are going too far and that the brakes must be applied. So facing clearly the fact that athletics must be with us, and that on the whole it is well that they should be with us, we must apply ourselves to the problem of making strong and effective and *primary* the intellectual purpose of the college.

Chapter VIII

THE PROBLEM OF THE COLLEGE

IF the preceding chapters have appeared pessimistic in their tone; if they have seemed a bit shrill; the fault is in the way in which the ideas are expressed and not with the purpose in view. That purpose is not to criticize the environment of the American boy and its reaction upon him: one might as well try to criticize the Atlantic Ocean as that. It is rather a question of the recognition of the fact that this environment does exist; that its reaction on the boy is a definite one; that its results must be kept in mind when the college sets itself to the task of accomplishing its purpose as an educational institution. No problem can be effectively studied, and no real solution for it can be found, unless it is surveyed as a whole, and unless those elements which are inherent in its nature and which cannot be avoided are separated from those which are under the control of him who is engaged in the task. Exactly that has been the aim of the preceding chapters.

But having recognized these troublesome and unavoidable factors, and with their effect clearly in mind, we come to the consideration of the problem itself. How is the college to fulfill its primary purpose? The answer must be, I think, that the college must so plan and so administer its work that the intellectual appeal becomes the central purpose; that the prime importance and the attractiveness of the intellectual life become fixed in the heart of the college; that things of the intellect loom so large in the atmosphere of the institution that even he who comes with no intellectual background is roused to action, and matters really subordinate sink naturally to their proper subordinate position. We may restrict matters which we consider extraneous or secondary, we may exercise compulsion in tasks which we consider necessary, but unless we honestly convince the student that things of the intellect are more essential to him than anything else he can get from college, so that he, of his own accord, centers his undergraduate life upon them, our success as an educational institution will not be great.

The critic will at once say that this is merely a high-sounding and vague generalization, and quite impossible of accomplishment: that, to use the expressive, if vulgar, phrase, it is "hot air." Vague generalizations are not uncommon in studies of education much more pretentious than this report; and impracticability is not an uncommon trait of the academic mind. It has been a fixed purpose to avoid such faults in this discussion. Vague the idea is not. Impossible? Perhaps. But before we reject it on this plea let us be sure that we are not of those who prefer leisurely to saunter in the level but featureless paths of things as they are, rather than laboriously to climb the worth-while heights of things as they ought to be. The fact that, unless the spirit of which we speak can be aroused in the college, the institution will never fully perform its proper function in the community, should make us examine every resource and put forward every effort for its attainment.

Of course the process will not be easy. In the professional and technical schools no such problem exists. When the undergraduate sees that his future bread and butter depends directly upon his success in mastering the task of the day, he is not likely to be diverted from it by any slight cause. The student of medicine does not leave the operating room at the critical point because it is 2.30, and the whole college is to give the team a "big send-off" as it departs for an important game. The work of the liberal college has no such obvious claim; it can never be argued that, if a student does not master a passage of Livy at a given time, his income ten years after will be affected. But we are perfectly sure that, in the long run, the advantage gained from the conscientious performance of tasks, of which the lesson from Livy is an example, will be to the student of a value at least equal to that obtained from his professional training. The task of the college, then, is to convince its undergraduates and the public from which they come that this is true. If it can be successfully done the primary difficulties of the college will largely disappear.

But before the undergraduate can be convinced, or the public convinced, those who guide the institution must themselves be convinced, of the validity of the principle. Not only must they be convinced but they must conduct the affairs of the college with that prime aim of the institution ever in view. Their understanding of and agreement with the primary purpose of the college must be such as to make them willing to subordinate

their own immediate interests to it. The faculty must be interested in education as a whole and not merely in the minute sub-division into which knowledge is now divided. There must be a live interest in educational problems; an interest which is steadily at work year after year, and not one which is sporadic and thereby ineffective. There must be team play and the willingness to subordinate pet principles and theories to the judgment of the majority. There must be a re-appraisement of ideas long and firmly held; to see if they may not be based on prejudice and imperfect information rather than on reason. There must be a sympathetic understanding of youth; of its instincts and its psychology. And there must be, most and greatest of all, intelligence; that intelligence which already has won success when applied to the specialty of the individual, now applied to the greater and more important problem of the college as a whole.

Signs are not wanting that the time is ripe for a new departure. In some institutions there may be observed among the students a movement of surprising vigor, to re-appraise the whole tone of undergraduate thought. The leaders of it are thoughtful men. They view the student outlook upon his college life and find it bad. They look upon the methods by which the college tried to carry out its purpose and find them worse. They may be too self-confident; prone to over quick judgment; too ready with blame; too little experienced to make their conclusions altogether valid; but they are earnest, intelligent and sincere. They attract a following. Some of it is like themselves; some of it is composed of the element which regards attack upon requirements and demands that exist as sure to lead to the ideal condition under which there are no requirements and demands at all. The movement is sporadic. One who goes from college to college is amazed at finding how scattered are its manifestations. It does not depend on the geographical position, nor on the character, nor on the prestige of the college. In some institutions it is in full swing; in others the outcrop of it is at once repressed by the ridicule of the conservative mass; in still others, so far as surface indications go, it does not exist at all: and all three may be located within a circle whose radius is not more than a hundred miles. It is sure, by its very success, to arouse vigorous opposition, so that within a period surprisingly brief it may be submerged by the reactionary protest of those who plead that the "good old traditions" of the college must at all odds be preserved. In some institutions there

is more than the suspicion that it is repressed from above. But it seems to be beyond doubt that, in the open or in concealment, there may be found in all institutions—and in ever increasing numbers—undergraduates who are carefully and coolly weighing the system of our colleges; men whose desire is for the best interests of the institution; who know that they are benefiting by its present work, but who know that they might profit vastly more if the system were changed; who are critical, not because they desire to criticize, but because they honestly believe that matters might be improved; and above all men who are both keen and honest. With the intelligent interest of this class as a nucleus to which to appeal, and through them to others not yet aroused, who can say that methods which shall make the intellectual purpose of the college, more than it now is, the center of its life, are to be sought in vain?

PART II

Chapter IX

THE BRITISH SYSTEM OF HIGHER EDUCATION

PERHAPS the best way of studying a perplexing problem is to get away from its immediate impact. If one who has been puzzling over questions which press for solution removes himself from their midst; if he, as a detached observer, and one without responsibility, views a problem of a similar nature elsewhere; if he studies the actual operation of experiments which may have been suggested at home; if he comes into touch with the point of view of a different people and sees the working of that point of view; he is likely to return with an enlarged perspective which will be of much service in the consideration of the pressing questions near at hand. On the one hand he is likely to form doubts of the validity of some of the principles which, from long acceptance, he has regarded as axiomatic; on the other hand he is quite sure to return better content with many of the conditions which he has been inclined to call in question. So, in the present investigation, it seemed best to leave for a time the observation of the American institution, and to study, as effectively as was possible in a time relatively short, the higher educational institutions of England and Scotland.

It was said by some that this process would be a waste of time: that customs are so different, the outlook on education so different, the whole British culture so different, as to make it possible to find no large common factor between their system and ours. It is, of course, true that these vital differences exist. No one could imagine that it would be possible to transfer a British university bodily to this country and have the operation a success: probably no single feature of the British system could be thus transferred without such modifications as to make the pattern unrecognizable in the product. Yet the grasp of a foreign point of view is worth having, even though it can never be the same as our own. From it we may modify our ideas to their advantage, even though those ideas remain, in essence, the same. Moreover there is a certain similarity in the problems of education no matter to what culture they may be applied. So,

while the culture will not change, it would be very hard to study what may be called the technique of education in a foreign land without finding in it the hint of promising modifications of the system at home. It may well be that the writer will not succeed in making the advantages of this study apparent in this report, but in his mind there is no doubt that they were gained.

It is not to be expected that a thorough understanding of British education can be acquired by a stay of three months in that land. The study must, at best, be superficial: one which will rather reveal the general tendencies of the system than give a profound insight into its character. It is hoped that these tendencies were correctly understood and properly interpreted. More could not be expected. Moreover, while documentary material was collected wherever possible, much of the information —and that the most valuable part—was obtained from personal interviews with many of the leaders of English education. It is obvious that misunderstandings and misinterpretations of meaning cannot be wholly excluded from information thus gained. It cannot be expected that such inaccuracies are entirely absent from the discussion which follows. The endeavor was made to check information whenever possible, and it is hoped that the inaccuracies are as few as may well be.

To the surprise of the American observer—although, if he is wise, he will conceal that surprise from any Scot whom he meets—the difference in purpose and method between the English university and its Scottish rival is profound. Edinburgh and Cambridge, though geographically so near, are in spirit as far apart as the poles. So the two systems will be taken up in separate parts of this report.

The English University

In England, Oxford and Cambridge are still *the* universities. From their establishment in the eleventh and twelfth centuries down to a hundred years ago they had no rivals: even yet, with active and able competitors, their prestige as the great centers of English higher education is still undimmed. So great is it that today, in their chosen field, the idea of competition with the younger institutions does not enter their thoughts; they are on a plane by themselves. But that competition does exist, and, as a matter of fact, has had no insignificant part in making their tone

what it is. In the eighteenth century they—particularly Oxford —were at their lowest ebb: an ebb to which it seems impossible that an educational institution could sink—and ever come back. Although improvement was under way, it was accelerated by the establishment of their first rival. The University of London was chartered in 1836. Despite its inchoate and ever-changing organization, its great body of colleges with degrees of affiliation so complex and bewildering that the American observer gives up in despair the task of trying to understand them, it became very soon a powerful rival, and bids fair, with the simplification or organization which is already under way, to be in time the world's greatest university. About the same time came the University of Durham, chartered in 1837, endowed from the revenues, embarrassingly large, of the Bishop of Durham: a unique example of a new institution housed in a splendid and historic setting: the feudal castle of the Palatine Prince-Bishops. Then came the provincial universities. Manchester was chartered in 1880, and originally included divisions in Liverpool and Leeds. These branches received independent charters and became separate institutions in 1903 and 1904 respectively. Birmingham, as a university, dates from 1900, Sheffield from 1905 and Bristol from 1910. However in all these cases the date of the grant of a university charter indicates by no means the time at which the institution was established. All of them are based on pre-existing colleges, which performed all the functions of a university except that of granting degrees. The care with which the award of degree-granting rights was guarded by Parliament has had desirable results. The necessity of conforming to certain standards has made impossible the mushroom-like growth of colleges, weak and pitiably inefficient, which is so common with us. At the same time the necessity for strength has made inevitable the federation of separate organizations in cities near each other into a combined institution with adequate resources; a process the unquestioned advantage of which has always been prevented in American by the tenacity with which each petty institution has held to its autonomy. The process of university making in England is still incomplete. There are four university colleges; Exeter, Nottingham, Reading and Southampton: institutions which do all the teaching that is done in a university, but whose students, if they desire a degree, must obtain it by passing the examinations of some chartered institution (usually London).

Some of these colleges seem almost ready for a university charter, and will probably receive it before long.

The effect of these institutions upon the spirit of Oxford and Cambridge must have been considerable. It was seen at once by those who, in its early years, had London in charge that high standards would be its best recommendation; and those standards were then made exacting and have been of that character ever since. The example of London was followed by the provincial universities. Furthermore the matter of theological affiliation and tests which, in the past, have loomed so large in the horizon of the older universities, has not usually assumed the proportion of a problem in the newer ones. It is true that it was a problem, and a most vexatious one, in the early days of London; but it was solved in a way, which if it caused for a time a complexity of organization truly English, nevertheless in a way which worked. Then, again, the founders of the newer institutions had as one of their most pressing motives the opening of the curriculum to a wide range of subjects with which Oxford and Cambridge, at the time, troubled themselves very little. For example they at once took a leadership in scientific work which even now, except for some departments at Cambridge, they have never lost. So in the development of modern times, while the educational progress in the older universities in these and other lines might well have taken the course which it did, there can be little doubt that the example of the newer institutions had much to do with accelerating it.

At the same time Oxford and Cambridge are not unduly moved by the influence of anyone. With them the fact that a certain requirement or method seems, on paper, wildly absurd does not induce them immediately to replace it. It may be that there are good reasons for it; it may be that, however absurd it seems, it works well; it may simply be that it has always been there. The changes which have been made in the last seventy years, changes which must make the Oxford or Cambridge of today seem strangely unfamiliar to the student of the fifties, show that so far as results go their conservatism is not extreme. But one seems to see in the attitude of the institutions a sense of assuredness, a confidence in their recognized position, which makes it unnecessary for them to respond to every passing whim of the day. Not only do they themselve seem to hold this idea of leadership, but it seems to be granted without serious question by the rest of England.

In former years a distinction could be drawn between the provincial universities and the older ones through the fact that the former were largely supported by public funds. This distinction in the future will not be true. In the solution of the question of the relation of the state to higher education, England has proceeded on a line which in this country has been found to be unworkable: that of state grants to institutions under private control. Thus in 1923 the figures in pounds and in percentages of the income of the English, Scotch and Welsh universities, excluding Oxford and Cambridge, are as follows:

	England		Wales		Scotland		Total	
	Pounds	%	Pounds	%	Pounds	%	Pounds	%
Endowments	252,784	9.6	18,104	6.7	119,073	17.2	389,961	10.9
Donations Subscriptions	58,586	2.2	9,065	3.4	12,791	1.9	80,422	2.2
Local Grants	334,422	12.8	54,405	20.3	38,354	5.5	427,181	11.9
Parl. Grants	914,108	34.9	127,795	47.6	233,666	33.8	1,275,569	35.6
Tuition	745,510	28.4	37,176	13.8	212,867	30.8	995,663	27.8
Examinations	166,012	6.3	9,785	3.6	68,039	9.8	243,836	6.8
Other	151,392	5.8	12,283	4.6	6,574	1.0	170,249	4.8
Total	2,622,814		268,613		691,464		3,582,891	

The difference between these figures and those of an American institution is striking. Particularly low is the income from endowments, and that from donations. The British universities, as a class, cannot rely on that steady flow of gifts from their alumni or from the public which the American institution enjoys. Sometimes gifts are made, sometimes they are large; but the feature of the American system that seems to arouse most envy in the mind of the English educator is the greater effective hold on the public, as expressed in this way, which our universities enjoy. On the other hand it will be seen that almost half of the total income of these institutions is from public money, either from Parliament or from local authorities.

Until recently Oxford and Cambridge have not felt the necessity of appealing for these grants. Expensive as their system of education is (and probably in no university in the world is the expense per student so large) the great estates of the individual colleges were sufficient to take care of the situation.

But the developments coming from the war changed all that, and both universities felt it necessary, unless their work was to be much restricted, to appeal to Parliament for help. The response was sympathetic; but it was evident that public money could not be devoted to an institution unless the nature of its income and the method of its expenditure were clear and open; and unless, further, it was evident that the income, when economically administered, was insufficient for the real needs of the university. Therefore a royal commission of twenty-three members, headed by Mr. Asquith, was established to inquire into the whole question of university and college funds and their use. Of course the matter was complicated. Most of the property is in the hands of the forty or more colleges of the two universities, and there was little uniformity in the way in which it was handled. In the mean time temporary allotments of £30,000 per year were made to each of the universities, to tide them over until a definite recommendation could be presented. The report of this commission appeared in 1922. Its conclusions had mainly to do with matters of finance, but in them it was quite impossible to avoid touching on points which had to do with the educational policies of the universities. A series of suggested changes was set forth: if these were adopted by the two universities the commission recommended that an annual grant amounting altogether to £110,000 be given to each. Both Oxford and Cambridge are now considering these conditions.

Of course there is always danger that a state subsidy given to a private institution may result in such a degree of state control as to hamper educational efficiency. Little harmful effect of this kind can be observed in England as yet. In the provincial universities, which from the first have relied on state aid, there is usually a cumbrous "Court of Governors", the membership of which may be as high as two hundred, and upon which pretty nearly any organization, public or private (including the teaching body), which may be thought to have an interest, however remote, in the institution, is represented. Most of these representatives probably take little part in the deliberations of this body; although it is, in theory, the final authority in the university. Most of the real work, however, is done by a council of about twenty members, upon which are representatives both of the teaching body and of the court. There is no question of extending even this slight measure of control

to Oxford and Cambridge. All in all the hampering influence of state or municipality is practically nil. Nevertheless the opportunity for harm is there. One who observes certain tendencies in English public life is not so sure that it may not in time become serious. It is not a pleasant thought to contemplate an Oxford which through state aid becomes in any way subservient in its educational policy to a future English government whose guiding spirit is that so vociferously expressed today in Parliament by the members from the banks of the Clyde. Even now one wonders whether Cambridge would accept of its own will one at least of the recommendations of the Royal Commission were not the financial necessity so great.

Chapter X

THE ENGLISH PRE-UNIVERSITY TRAINING

TIME was not available in this survey to investigate with any care the English school. Only two were visited, and those much the same in their general purpose. What is to be said, therefore, is derived for the most part from conversations with university teachers and has to do with the school in its relation to the university.

Two or three general tendencies may first be pointed out. One of these is the custom, not by any means universal, but not uncommon, of sending boys away to school at an age when the American mother would regard them as hardly having emerged from babyhood. It is quite possible (though it usually does not begin so soon) for children from the age of eight to be acquainted with home only from the contacts of their vacation periods. It is obvious that there are many disadvantages in this method, but it is equally obvious that by it the school is given, through complete control of the activities of the child, a wonderful opportunity to apply whatever methods of training seem best to it, with the best possible chance of success. Moreover the teaching of boys is largely in the hands of men. Some English educators deplore the presence even of the relatively small number of female teachers in the English school for boys as it now is; and would proceed on the theory that every teacher of a boy from the age of eight on should be a man. Of course they do not at all understand a system in which practically the entire instruction of the boy up to fourteen, as well as the greater part of it up to eighteen, is in feminine hands. Nor would the movement for equal pay to women teachers, with its tendency still more to drive the masculine element out of the profession, appeal to them as advantageous. Again, subjects which we restrict to later years are begun early. The boy starts Latin at eight. By the time he is nineteen, and ready to enter the university, if he has profited from his instruction, he is likely to have a better command of it as a language than is acquired by many an American youth who specializes in the classics all through his college course.

At the head of the English secondary school system stands the "public school"; an institution unique among the schools of the world. Winchester and Eton and Harrow and Rugby and the rest hold in the affection of their sons a peculiar place; one which is never weakened, as with us, by the subsequent claims of the college or university. These schools may take their choice among the boys coming from the best families of England; they have a prestige of historic tradition; they have pride in what they have done, and confidence in the worth of what they are now doing. Then come other schools, day schools they may be; also old, also with the consciousness of fine work in the past; with a reputation perhaps less widespread, because as institutions they lack the extraneous and spectacular features which have made the fame of the public school, but which is solid among those who know. Finally we have the newer institutions, "secondary schools." technically so called, either controlled by the public or partially supported by it, which have risen to fill the increased demand for education everywhere felt in modern times. For while in England the guiding principle is not, as with us, that every boy may extend his training at the public expense so far as he will; it is true that he may thus extend it so far as he can show that his capacity warrants the effort.

With schools so diverse in historical perspective, what is the unifying principle? It seems to the foreign observer that the system is moulded by the older universities, acting largely through their scholarship and exhibition examinations. The English school gains prestige by its success in intellectual performance; but with them, as is not so much the case with us, intellectual performance, so far as it relates to the product of the school, does have a definitely recognized scale of measurement. It is an honorable thing and a difficult thing to win the scholastic prizes of the English universities; it is so recognized by everybody, and especially by the student mass who are most concerned. When the boys from a certain school begin to take these honors, the prestige of the school at once increases; the dons of the Oxford and Cambridge colleges begin to look upon it with interest; the way of its graduates into these colleges grows more easy; parents hear of its success; the general public learns of it; and soon that school attracts more and more that very class of boys through which more easily that prestige may be maintained. When one goes into the assembly room of such a school as that

of the City of London, maintained from funds left nearly five hundred years ago by John Carpenter, town clerk when Whittington was Lord Mayor, and finds on the walls, where all daily must see them, tablets on which the names of the old boys of the school who have achieved the scholastic honors of Oxford and Cambridge are emblazoned, one begins to feel that he grasps the drawing power of the idea. And one, a bit ruefully, thinks of the kind of records which would be on such tablets at home. Thus, through all England, success in the scholastic competitions of the great universities is the goal which the school has in mind.

How does the school go about the accomplishment of this purpose? The course until the boy is sixteen is usually a very general one. At this point he should be ready to take the lower school certificate examinations: tests which, as a rule, do not appear to be as advanced as those commonly given with us for college entrance. On paper there seems no reason why he should not now proceed directly to the university. But he very seldom does. If he has shown by this time no particular mental ability or taste for things scholastic, his parents are advised to take him from school; the school authorities do not care from this age to waste their effort on the dull or the indifferent. But if he shows promise, he remains in school and devotes his attention very largely to those closely related subjects in which he takes most interest: he becomes thus early a specialist. At nineteen he is ready for the higher school certificate examination in those subjects; an examination which may fairly be said to equal in its requirements those given at the end of Sophomore year in our colleges. He now enters the university. In addition to this test, the better men, thus intensively trained, compete for the Oxford and Cambridge scholarships and exhibitions by taking still further examinations of the most searching character.

A course like this at once brings to the American observer a picture of premature and intense specialization, a condition which we go to such trouble to avoid. The whole subject of specialization in the English system is one which must be discussed in much detail later in this report. So far as it relates to the school, however, any suggestion that this is the effect of their system, when made to the teachers in the schools, is received by them with a surprise which is evidently sincere. They are convinced that their course is quite the opposite of a specialized one. They believe that the general nature of the work

up to sixteen, the home background of the boy, the character of the teaching force, and, most of all, the atmosphere of the school, check this tendency should it ever develop. In the older schools this belief is probably justified. The prestige of the institution allows it to develop its own theories without undue regard to tests imposed from above. Moreover the character of the student body is such that the application of these theories can be made to the best advantage. The Master of Winchester declared that his school troubled itself very little about the requirements of Oxford and Cambridge. It was to be expected that whatever hurdles the universities might set up would cause little trouble to a Winchester product, and that the training given in the school would win for its boys a goodly share of the university honors. Moreover it was taken for granted that the recommendation of the school would of itself count for much with the Oxford authorities. These things being taken as a matter of course, the institution could devote its real attention to the education of the individual boy, with the purpose of starting him on the road to becoming a well read, intelligent, intellectually curious gentleman. As we went into one of the old study rooms we met a sixth form boy, the prefect of the room. His little cubicle was lined with books. The master picked up two ponderous tomes and asked where they came from. The boy said that he had picked them up in a second hand shop in London, and added, in a perfectly unaffected manner, that they were rather amusing. They were volumes of a Latin author whose very name was unknown to the chemist, and with the works of whom the master, a classical scholar, was not particularly familiar. Then came a set of an English historian of the seventeenth century, long out of print, and forgotten by everyone save the specialist. The boy had read these, too, and had read them not as a task, but because he enjoyed the process. And so it went. The youth was not a prig; he was utterly free from self-consciousness; he was said to be one of the best football players in the school, and a leader in its life. Of course all Winchester boys are not like that. The old public schools are subject, and probably justly subject, to attack. But a school which can produce even a few men of this type has justified its existence.

While the claim that specialization is not excessive when made by the older school is probably valid, one is not sure that

it can so well be urged by the newer ones. Time was not available to visit institutions of this type, but from the testimony of the university men, particularly those of the provincial institutions, it seems likely that in this respect there is some reason for dissatisfaction. The transfer bodily of the machinery of an institution, without the transfer of the atmosphere which surrounds it, may show that it is the atmosphere rather than the machinery which accomplishes the results. A course of study such as that outlined above ought on the face of it to produce a product which is narrow, and there is reason to believe, unless other factors serve to counteract the tendency, that that is precisely what it does. Such is the testimony of many of those who have to do with the product of the newer schools.

Quite apart from the method of training, the English system suggests to the American observer another doubt. Is it well for boys of considerable maturity and of fairly high mental development to be kept so long in an institution which is mainly devoted to the training of those of a much more tender age? Should they not come into the university environment at an earlier age? The English educators themselves differ radically on this point, but there is no difference of opinion on the part of the school men. At the heart of their system of school government is the authority of the older boy, the prefect, in the regulation of the tone of the school and in the administration of its discipline. Those who have charge of the pre-university training are sure that no experience can be of more advantage to a boy than the responsibility which this process entails; and that no system is so effective for the school as one which keeps its members in its fold to an age at which that responsibility can be assumed. Some of those who have passed through the schools are not so sure of the desirability of the principle, and many university teachers are quite convinced that both student and university would profit by an earlier age of matriculation. There seems to be no tendency, however, to put into effect practical measures based on these objections.

We have then (with certain marked exceptions which will be discussed later) the English boy entering the university at nineteen. His education up to sixteen has been general; from that time on it has been characterized by a considerable degree of specialization in certain subjects. In these subjects he has

commonly gone much farther than is usually the case with the American boy. In all probability this specialization will already have determined in what direction his university course will lie. He will have respect for scholarly achievement, although he may have no desire to attain it for himself. If he comes from the public school he will have acquired that measure of poise which comes from the experience of handling boys, but he may not have to so marked a degree the maturity which comes to the American student from his association with the world at large. How, then, is he to be treated by the English university?

Chapter XI

THE OLDER UNIVERSITIES

OXFORD

THE two historic universities of England stand by themselves among the educational institutions of the world. There can be no just comparison between them and any other. Their physical aspect, their educational outlook, and most of all, their atmosphere, are such as to make them institutions apart. They are in many ways alike, but they show, also, striking differences. If in this discussion much more is said of Oxford than of Cambridge, it is because, for convenience, those factors which are more or less common to the two are taken up in the description of the former institution. Later an attempt will be made to point out the particular directions in which Cambridge has peculiarities of its own.

General Atmosphere

That intangible thing, the atmosphere of an institution, is really what serves to differentiate it from others of its kind. It is something which develops in the college with its growth, and which can hardly be transferred to another, however carefully the attempt may be made. It is of course impossible for the observer, in a limited time, to grasp its meaning and to estimate its force. In fact, through observation of externals, he is likely to gain an utterly distorted idea. Nevertheless, as the atmosphere makes the place what it is, no understanding of the institution can be complete unless this central guiding principle be given its proper meaning.

For one who does not long live within its confines, the atmosphere of Oxford is peculiarly difficult to apprehend. The unrivalled charm of the place, its spires and towers and pinnacles, its old quads in seeming ruin, its lawns smooth with the care of centuries, its forbidding iron-spiked walls, its splendid gardens, its narrow lanes, its memories of great men who in the nine

centuries of its history have walked its courts; all make at first an impression upon the visitor which is overwhelming. He feels at once that he is beginning to grasp the spirit of the university, to appreciate what these external surroundings must mean to one bred in the English tradition who lives under their influence. But it is to be doubted whether he really does know that influence. He knows the superficial impression upon himself: that he can measure the extent or quality of the impression upon the Oxford undergraduate is not so clear. The testimony of an American just completing his third year in the old university is to the point. At first he was carried away by the surface glamor of the institution; then as time went on he was depressed by certain uncongenial factors of its life; and it was only in the third year that the true relation of things came home to him, and he recovered an enthusiasm not like the original one, but which was truer as it was solidly based on an understanding of the real spirit of the university. To understand Oxford, one must long live within her walls.

But the surface impression is none the less strong. One who has seen many of the universities of America, and who in them has viewed the Gothic as applied to their structures—neat, well planned, beautiful as it may be—is depressed by the contrast to the old Oxford. Let him wander to Peckwater quad at Christ's Church, drawn in spite of himself time after time by the seeming ruin, by the cracked and scaling walls, the pilasters half gone, the cornices disintegrated, all in apparent dilapidation though structurally still sound, but with the feeling of the ever-young spirit of the institution still strong in its hoary walls. Then in his mind's eye he brings back the image of the Harkness quadrangle and of the new Princeton and wonders if they quite fit the picture of an American college; if, after all, it would have not been more in keeping with the tone of the institution to have modeled on such lines as those of Nassau Hall. And at least one hopes, though with little confidence, that, as at Oxford, our builders were compelled to use an inferior stone for the construction; one that will peel and scale and crack so that the clear cut outlines and the glaring newness will soon disappear, and the structure, worn and frayed, will seem better to fit the picture of a cloistered college.

No, the spirit of Oxford cannot be caught; and even if it were, it could not be transferred across the sea. But the ma-

chinery of Oxford, its theories of education and their application; of these something can be gained and much can be learned by their consideration. The following discussion must limit itself to that alone.

The Oxford College

Peculiar to the older English universities is the system of colleges. It was not always so. In their organization Oxford and Cambridge were corporations of masters and teachers, of whom no demand was made except the educational development of their students. But it soon became apparent that it was a risky experiment to send boys of fourteen without guidance into these university towns, with hordes of disreputable characters who were attracted by the easy pickings there found. So at the end of the thirteenth century the first colleges were established; colleges which should provide food and lodgings for these boys and which also should care for their discipline and control. To these objects were soon added those of the assistance of poor boys of ability by college foundations, the recruiting of the depleted ranks of the secular clergy, the furtherance of the study of theology and the extirpation of current heresies and errors. To found a college early became attractive to benefactors, who might thus perpetrate effectively their names and their ideas. So the colleges grew numerous, they acquired splendid buildings and large estates. Up to this point the movement in England was not essentially different from that on the continent. But now came a purely English development. The Tudor sovereigns found the bending of the colleges to their will much easier than that of the university. They therefore increased the power of the former at the expense of the latter, and the movement thus started grew of its own impetus, until in the days of James II that monarch found that the machine so created had become sufficiently strong to be able to combat with success the crown itself. The college, instead of dying out as it did in the continental universities, soon absorbed practically all the powers of the institution except those of setting examinations and granting degrees. While a reaction from this extreme position is under way, in Oxford at least that condition is not far from the one existing today.

We have in Oxford twenty-one colleges; each with its own buildings and grounds, with its own endowments, with its own

administrative organization, and with its own teaching force.* These colleges have practically all the money; the university very little. The college has complete control of admission and almost complete control of discipline. It does the greater part of the teaching. Each has its own library and, in some cases, its own laboratories. It has its own domestic arrangements; it furnishes lodgings to its students, and also meals, either in the great hall, or served from the college kitchen in their own rooms. It supplies servants for the students. Its teachers control both the business and educational policies of the college; they are the owners of its property; and they alone appoint new members of the staff. To the university is left the power of setting examinations and granting degrees; in addition it does a limited amount of teaching, it has some powers of discipline, and it maintains general libraries and laboratories.

Life at Oxford as centered in the college is the most pleasing feature of the institution. The individual colleges are relatively small: the largest having not more than four hundred students, and many not more than one hundred. For the first two years practically all the undergraduates live in college lodgings. The rooms are old and worn, but generally comfortable (as English ideas of comfort go). The "scout," that genuinely British institution, takes rather too good care of the men under his charge. Dinners are served to all together in the great hall: other meals may be obtained from the college kitchen and served in one's own room; where pleasant breakfast and lunch parties are common. A commons room provides for general intercourse. Everyone knows everyone else. The opportunity for conversation and discussion is unlimited and is taken advantage of to the full. In no institution is there so good an opportunity for men to mould and form each other by personal contact as here. These conversations, perhaps more than with us, seem to be concerned with things worth while, and to embrace a wide variety of interests. Of course there is excellent opportunity for an individual to waste his time; he may confine his college experience to contacts; and contacts, by choice, the least valuable that he can find. Even the earnest man may be led, by finding friends so many and so pleasant, to devote more time than he should to social intercourse. Every system has the

*In addition there are eighteen subsidiary organizations, including provision for non-collegiate students, five theological institutions, and five colleges and societies for women.

evils which arise from its own excellencies. Of no small advantage is the general tone of the social life of the college. The one thing of which the student body of Oxford is absolutely intolerant is bad manners; and by bad manners one is inclined to believe that the undergraduate means manners which are different from those of the cultivated Englishman. Conformity to type, elsewhere not so much demanded as at home, is here absolutely necessary if the boy is to get much from the contacts at Oxford. On the whole it may be said that the college life at Oxford and Cambridge appeals to the foreign observer as the one feature of those institutions which most distinctively separates them from all others, and which is the greatest factor in making the results of their training what they are.

The discipline of the English college seems quite inverted to the American observer. As a whole the English student is relatively free from outside pressure as applied to his scholastic work. Within rather wide limits, he can go his own pace without being worried by prodding from above. The army of deans and other officers who, with us, by methods ranging from gentle coaxing to harsh threats, endeavor to persuade the student to become such in fact as well as in name, are not quite unknown in England, but they are not at all obtrusive. On the other hand attention is paid to matters which strike the American with astonishment. The authorities are concerned that the student be within the college walls by midnight, that he appear at hall a certain number of times a week, that he wear his gown on specified occasions, that he does not absent himself from town, that he does not store his motorcycle in a garage not acceptable to the university authorities. And so it goes. Dignified university officials, the proctors, accompanied by university servants, wander the streets at night to waylay those who infringe university rules, although it is said by the cynical that the activity of these persons is to some extent regulated by the state of the university exchequer and the desirability at times of strengthening its condition by the fines imposed as a penalty for the breaking of regulations. Of course these rules are by no means taken with entire seriousness by the student body, but the protest against them assumes the form of surreptitious scaling of the college walls (with occasional impalement on the spikes above) rather than that of a concerted plea for their abolition. They have always been a part of university discipline and

the English student takes them for granted. The American boy who has in his own college protested against the care with which the officials endeavor to insure his attention to his work, and who has pointed to the English practice in this respect as the model to follow, is likely to be somewhat dazed when he comes in contact with these seemingly petty regulations to which he is so unused at home.

Of course there are great differences between the various Oxford colleges; differences in wealth, in prestige, in outlook. Some of them, such as Balliol and New College, have set themselves definitely toward a marked degree of scholastic excellence; some of them seem to attract a constituency notable for its "sporty" tendencies; some of them are predominantly athletic; some of them simply have to take what material is left after the others have had their pick, and to do the best they can with a student body not particularly promising. It is very difficult for a college to change its status. In the first place it has acquired a constituency of a fairly definite type, from which it cannot break away without leaving itself more or less in the air, and that constituency may be one in which men of scholarly type are not common. Then again the dice are loaded against the poorer colleges. The scholarship and exhibition examinations are the same for all and are given at the same time. But those entering students who make the best records naturally choose the colleges of greatest prestige and those with the largest scholarships. Moreover there is active competition among the colleges for the men of the most promise; a competition termed scandalous by some Oxford men themselves, and which proceeds by almost open bidding between these colleges for the men they particularly want. In this competition the poorer colleges naturally lose, and must content themselves with what the others do not want. So, although a poor college may have—and often does have—a most effective teaching body, the work of these teachers is seldom conspicuous because they have no material out of which to develop those stars of the academic firmament upon which the scholastic reputation of the college rests—the firsts in the final examinations. On the other hand there is evidence that the whole tone of Oxford is being raised; that as a result of the war and its depressing influence on the incomes of men of landed estates, the necessity of serious purpose in the Englishman of the upper class is more pronounced

than it has been before. While the differences in the colleges will probably always exist, the level of the lowest is being raised.

It is equally evident that the college system cannot be run as economically as one in which the administration is centralized. Twenty-one different estates, ranging from those so small that the business is cared for rather casually by a single fellow who teaches the rest of the day, to great endowments bringing an annual revenue of a hundred thousand pounds. Twenty-one different kitchens and dining halls, with twenty-one stewards purchasing competitively in a local and restricted market with no common understanding between them. All this does not make for economical management. One visits the Radcliffe Camera, the reading room of the Bodleian Library. It is architecturally splendid, but utterly inadequate in size for the demands made upon it. Then one proceeds to a college nearby, and finds in it a splendid library room, imposing in size and admirable in design, its walls well lined with books—and for all furniture one small table and two chairs, both unoccupied. The American observer is seized with the impatient desire to shake things up a bit and to impose certain improvements, the need and practicability of which seem obvious. The Royal Commission already mentioned seems to have had something of the same feeling, for many of its recommendations had to do with the unifying of the finance and of the business details of the colleges; measures which would do much to restrict their autonomy. At the same time, most wisely, there was nothing in the report which would tend to mar their activity as the essential centers of the Oxford system.

For after all they are the center of the system and England can well congratulate herself that in the evolution of her universities, unlike the development from similar beginnings elsewhere, the colleges emerged as they did. Nevertheless their effectiveness comes from that evolution; from the fact that in the slow course of time they came to fit naturally into the system as we find it today. The endeavor to create anew something to resemble them, to create it out of whole cloth with a designed purpose definitely in view, would be interesting but we could not be over-optimistic as to its success. On the whole the American college is so organized and so rooted that there seems to be little chance of imposing upon it a system which, however good may be its success in its natural environment, is not indigenous to our soil.

Chapter XII

OXFORD
REQUIREMENTS FOR ADMISSION

LIKE so many things English, the admission requirements of Oxford and Cambridge strike the foreign observer as a system completely chaotic, but one which, despite the chaos, is in its results fairly effective. To one used to the American method, with its definiteness, its units and its various hurdles to be passed before the candidate can be matriculated, the English system seems no system at all. In fact, as it works out, men in all stages of preparation, from that considerably lower than is required by us to one fairly comparable to the status reached by our students after two years of college work, seem to be admitted on equal terms. But that is exactly what the system is supposed to do.

In the first place admission is entirely in the hands of the colleges. No one can become a member of the university until he has been accepted by one of these units, or by the authorities in charge of the non-collegiate group. As the university makes no prescription whatsoever, the colleges naturally deviate much from each other in requirements which they set up. In the university literature about all that can be said as to admission is that "the practice varies so widely that no general rule can be given," and the candidate is referred to the respective colleges for more definite information.

Nevertheless one of the three series of examinations which the university requires for the attainment of the degree, responsions, serves in a certain way as an entrance test. The subjects for this examination are divided into three groups.

I Latin, Greek
II English, Modern Languages
III Mathematics, Natural Sciences

The candidate must pass examinations either (a) in both subjects of group I and in two subjects of group III; or (b) in four subjects altogether, which must include at least one from each group,

two of the subjects being foreign languages. These tests, both in quantity and in quality, seem considerably less than our requirements for entrance. As a matter of fact probably very few students actually take these examinations. It is provided that the lower school certificate examinations of the various boards shall be deemed equivalent to responsions, provided that the subjects are rightly chosen, and most boys long before they enter the university remove the requirement in this way. Most colleges demand that responsions or its equivalent be passed before college entrance. Nevertheless there is absolutely no university rule to this effect; and it is perfectly possible for individual colleges to admit students without even this minimum of attainment. In the past this was done very frequently, so that men of extraordinarily low standards of accomplishment, and probably of desire, became members of the university, and remained in the place, without doing any work, as long as the experience was pleasurable. This abuse is very uncommon at present, but there is evidence that it is not entirely unknown. At any rate the Royal Commission of 1922 felt that the chance of improper admission was not entirely excluded; and therefore recommended that definite uniform entrance examinations should be set up by the *university*, and that no student should be admitted by any college until this examination was passed. From the context of the report it is evident that the Commission had in mind nothing of higher standard than the present rather low one of responsions, and that it was interested in correcting the abuse of admission with less than this minimum, rather than in raising the whole tone of admission requirements.

This has to do with the lowest part of the scale. As a matter of fact the great majority of students are at a much more advanced stage of preparation than this. After they have reached the point at which responsions or its equivalent is out of the way (a point at which, on paper, they seem ready for the university) they still remain two or three years in school; they probably proceed to the higher school certificate examinations and bring such credentials with them upon matriculation. In addition, some colleges impose entrance tests of their own; not tests covering more advanced work, but limited to the material upon which other examinations have already been passed, and designed simply to give another basis of information in judging the candidate. The recommendations of the masters of the second-

ary school are also at hand. With all this information at the disposal of the college officers the candidates are considered separately and selection from them is made. The college seems to be a law unto itself; no one has any right of protest concerning its decision. The more scholarly colleges are very critical; their selection of men is limited to those who not only give evidence of fairly high mental calibre, but who have already made considerable progress. They would not for a moment consider a man who had merely passed responsions: the higher school certificate or something equivalent to it would surely be necessary. Other colleges (what follows is derived from inference rather than from direct statements) while they apply such tests to the average man, admit some with influential connections who have much lower acquirements; still other colleges are more or less bound to a certain constituency and take all reasonable cases presented by that group, and some frankly have to take what they can get. The final outcome is a university body made up of men of rather astounding differences of attainment, although, theoretically, they are on the same plane: and further, a segregation, not complete but relative, of men into colleges in such a way that each college has, more or less, a character of its own.

This seeming chaos is not chaos at all, but an organization which serves very well a perfectly definite purpose. It is recognized that the prime object of the university is intellectual, and that it is best served by starting with material in which the intellectual impulse has been aroused. At the same time it is also recognized, with the English social system as it is, that it is the duty of the university to provide the upper classes in England —in the past the governing classes of the country—with the education which a gentleman is supposed to have. This does not mean scholarship in the technical sense (though men of scholarly interests and acquirements are by no means rare in this group) but it does mean the development that comes from the contacts and friendships of university life and a modicum of the intellectual impulse which can hardly fail to come in some measure from exposure to the university atmosphere. Not only in its admission standards, but in the requirements of the curriculum, the institution frankly sets itself to meet this demand, and it does meet it with a considerable degree of success. Of course, with the rapid change now going on in English society, the university also is changing, but its organization is such that the change is taking place with no apparent disturbance.

Now comes the interesting feature of the situation. Of all the educational institutions in the world, the American college of liberal arts is the one which is most clearly presented with a problem precisely similar. Of course our social system is radically different from that of the English, and the details of the problem are not at all the same, but, in essence, we can recognize in many of the students coming to us precisely the same motives that for years have sent the upper class Englishman to Oxford and Cambridge. We have treated the problem in quite a different way; instead of frankly recognizing its effects and providing for them, we have ignored the fact that the problem exists. It is not to be expected that a solution from English experience could be applied directly to American conditions: in fact the weaknesses of the English system are so evident that no one would follow it directly. But the Oxford point of view should certainly be helpful in the consideration of our own difficulties. We cannot do more than state the question at this point. The discussion of it may well be delayed until we have considered in what way Oxford proceeds to treat these two classes of men in her college course.

Chapter XIII

OXFORD
PASS AND HONORS COURSES

WE now come to a feature of the English educational method which is by no means confined to Oxford, but is found under different forms in all the British universities: the system of pass and honors courses. When a boy enters an Oxford college he is at once confronted with the necessity of choosing which of these two paths he shall follow. As will be seen, the choice is not a particularly difficult one: he is given advice which is likely to amount to direct pressure as to the direction in which he shall turn. Nevertheless he does have these alternatives.

Let us first consider the work for the pass degree. The student probably enters the university with training in two languages—one of which must be Greek or Latin—and two other subjects. The first hurdle which he must overcome is technically termed the First Public Examination, but is commonly called Moderations. This examination must be taken not earlier than the end of the third term in the university and not later than the end of the sixth term: it is usually passed at the end of the first year. A part of it, required of both pass and honors men, is a test in the Holy Scriptures. For the remainder of the pass moderations the subjects are arranged in three groups.

I Latin, Greek
II English, Greek History or Literature, French, German
III Mathematics, Logic, Political Economy

The student must pass examinations in four subjects, at least one of which must be from each group, and must include two languages other than English.

This disposes of the work of the first year. The final test before the degree comes in what is called the Second Public Examination. As the university imposes a requirement of residence for nine terms (three years) before the degree can be obtained, this test is not taken before the end of the third year.

In it the choice of subjects is much wider, and includes, in addition to those mentioned above, the natural sciences, Hebrew, History, Political Science, Law, Italian, Spanish, Religious Knowledge, and Military History. Examinations must be passed in *three* subjects, of which one must be a language selected from a list of seven. The other two are unrestricted. For two years, then, the student is (theoretically) devoting his entire time to the three subjects which he selects.

It is thus apparent that the pass student may make his course a fairly general one. He must do a reasonable amount of linguistic work, and must carry that work in some one language quite far, but aside from that he is left comparatively free. He does not take so many subjects as do our students, but he must do rather more with the subjects which he does take. The university as such is concerned merely with his success in the examinations; it does not interest itself at all in his method of preparing for them. The examinations seem to be relatively circumscribed: preparation for them can be made by a reading of material which is fairly definite; they are supposed to test the mastery by the student of the elementary principles of the subject and do not require a comprehensive grasp of it as a whole. No "classes" are awarded with the pass degree, and no distinctions are made as a result of the examinations except the one distinction of passed or failed. All in all the pass course appeals to the observer as a reasonable solution of the problem presented by the boy desirous of receiving a general education—and continues to make that appeal until the method of its administration is studied.

The honors course proceeds upon an entirely different principle. There are in Oxford ten honors schools; but some of them are so divided into branches that the actual number of honors subjects is nearly thirty. Some of the schools take charge of the student from the beginning. In these cases moderations of the ordinary type are replaced either by special honors moderations, as in Greek and Latin literature and mathematics, or by preliminary examinations, as in natural science, jurisprudence and modern history. In other cases the work of the first year is preparatory to the ordinary pass moderations, with the prescription, nevertheless, that the student must be examined at that point in certain definite subjects. In other words the selection of subjects in the first year must be made with the particular

honors course in view. The work from that time on is entirely devoted to preparation for the final honors examinations, to be taken not before the end of the third year and not later than the end of the fourth year. These tests are under the control of the honors faculty in question, and, in the main, are limited to the various branches of one subject. Thus the student who takes the honors course in chemistry is examined in nothing but chemistry, although the questions may be so set as to involve a considerable acquaintance with physics and mathematics, and, very likely, a reading knowledge of French and German. The examinations in modern history are upon historical topics, but require in the student who is to meet them the ready use of Latin and one other foreign language, a knowledge of economics and skill in English composition. It is regarded as perfectly legitimate to expect in the examinations acquaintance with subjects which are related to the main topic or which are useful in its pursuit, but it is not considered necessary to stipulate that individual courses of instruction in those branches shall be taken. The student is expected to get them as best he may. The main topic is the essential thing and the examinations call for a highly specialized and complete acquaintance with its subject matter. The bright central light of the whole Oxford system of honors courses is the school of Literae Humaniores, or "greats." This embraces the study of the Greek and Latin languages, the history of ancient Greece and Rome, and classical logic and philosophy; all to be studied as far as possible from the original authors. The assumption being granted that about all that man has ever known or will know (except in natural science) is found in the works of the classical writers, it is felt that thorough acquaintance with the works of these authors, such as is required by this school, prepares a man for almost any walk in life. The scholastic star of Oxford is the man who makes a first in "greats." While it is probably no longer true that one who has achieved success in the classics is assumed to be fully prepared for a professorship in the natural sciences (an assumption not at all uncommon at Oxford and Cambridge many years ago), nevertheless, within reasonable limits, he is considered to be equipped for anything. So it is not uncommon to find at Oxford teachers of various subjects not commonly considered classical in their nature whose training was mainly in the domain of the classics, and whose scholastic reputations rest upon their achievements in the school of Literae Humaniores in their undergraduate days.

It will be seen that the preparation for these examinations requires work of a highly specialized character. The purpose of the examination is to make sure that precisely that has been done. At the conclusion of his honors course the student is expected to have obtained a broad command of the field, to have mastered its work so that he feels at home in it. The examinations are set with the purpose, not of testing the student as to his knowledge of details, or as to the way he has covered certain fixed assignments and readings, but as to his command of the subject as a whole, and his ability, through the grasp which he has thus acquired, to handle effectively new material that may be presented. As with the pass course, the university is not interested in the manner in which the student prepares himself for these examinations: it is the result alone which counts. The work is considered real work and, as such, worthy of definite measurement. The graduates of the honors school, unlike the pass men, are divided into four "classes", and the attainments of the students are thus a matter of record. A first in an honors school is a real distinction, while a fourth is something else.

One who studies this system comes at once to the conclusion that it is a very reasonable one. For the general student who is desirous of what we call a broad education the pass course with its variety of subjects is available: while to the man of ability and of particular interest in some one branch of learning is presented the honors course which allows him to go as far as he likes. The desires of everybody are therefore satisfied. But if anyone gains the impression that this is the outcome of the system, his error is most serious. On paper it might seem to work that way; as administered, its effect is absolutely different.

A fundamental characteristic which extends through all English universities is the high valuation of the honors course and the extremely low estimate of the pass. Although this feeling exists everywhere, it is found in its extreme form at Oxford. Consequently, when a student of more than average ability enters an Oxford college, the question is not whether he shall take an honors or pass course, but rather which honors course he shall select. Even that question has often been answered three years before, when the boy started the process of specialization in the school. In the university his normal course is to continue in a more extensive way the study of the subject then chosen. So it frequently happens that a youth is put under pressure at

sixteen to select that branch of learning around which practically all his subsequent formal education will center. The tendency is to push even the man of mediocre ability into an honors course. He will never attain any distinction in its work, he will probably not be required to exert himself unduly (a fourth class in honors is not an achievement which calls for extreme mental effort) but he is considered to be better off in a scholarly group of his superiors than in the general ruck of the unambitious. At any rate he will place himself, in the eyes of the university, as one who is not entirely without regard for things intellectual, while if, despite this advice, he chooses a pass course, then he no longer has any intellectual status. As a matter of fact, many of the more important Oxford colleges will not accept the pass man at all; they confine their work to honors candidates alone. No one takes the pass man seriously, no one pays him more than perfunctory attention, no one considers him capable of any scholarly interests. He participates in the social and athletic life of the university; he gains what he can from the contacts of his three years residence; he finally, without much mental effort, receives his degree; and then takes his predestined place, living the traditional life and performing the traditional duties of the English gentleman—or did before the great upset of the war. It is not a foreign criticism, but the testimony of Oxford men themselves, that the greatest reproach to the institution is the low esteem in which it holds the pass degree.

	Men		Women	
	honors	pass	honors	pass
Oxford	896	145	181	27
Cambridge	798	592		123
London	474	289	289	124
Durham	65	179	11	50
Birmingham	117	100	28	28
Bristol	54	70	28	31
Exeter	13	5	4	0
Leeds	102	98	49	31
Liverpool	108	142	39	89
Manchester	136	199	79	45
Nottingham	59	20	15	0
Reading	9	15	11	6
Sheffield	47	64	25	41
Southampton	10	4	5	4
Total	2,888	1,922	764	599

The effect upon the student body is obvious. The contempt, from an intellectual point of view, with which the pass man is regarded and the changes in the social system of the country which make it more necessary than formerly that college work be taken seriously is tipping the balance between pass and honors men far in the direction of the latter. The movement is not limited to Oxford. The preceding table gives the numbers of first degrees in pass and honors courses granted in 1923 to men and women by the English universities.

Thus sixty per cent of the men who receive degrees from the English universities have taken the honors course; while at Oxford the extreme of eighty-six per cent is reached. The pass course at the oldest of the universities seems on its way to becoming extinct.

It may be said, therefore, that if a student at Oxford wishes to preserve his intellectual self-respect, he must take an honors course; and, further, that taking an honors course involves a degree of specialization which would be encouraged in no American institution, and would be tolerated in but few. The reply of the Oxford teacher to the charge of over-specialization is twofold. In the first place, he denies that such a result is actually produced. If one considers the character of the student and the whole reaction of Oxford it seems evident that a broadening force is at work which effectively counteracts the narrowing tendency of the honors system, if, indeed, such a narrowing tendency be admitted to exist. The boy is likely to come from a home with a broad cultural background. He has been to a school in which his training to the age of sixteen was general; moreover, the atmosphere of the school may have been such as to counteract the specializing tendency of its later years. He enters a college of the university. He lives its common life. He meets on terms of intimacy men of varied tastes. The opportunity for the exchange of ideas and for forming interests quite remote from the central one of his university life is hardly equalled in any other educational institution in the world; and that opportunity is utilized to its fullest extent. Exposed to this contagion he can hardly escape its effect. He is almost sure to become a man whose intellectual interest in the wide field of human knowlege has been effectively aroused. Such is the plea of the Oxford teacher. One who comes in contact with the Oxford student is inclined to admit that this essential purpose of the college is served by the Oxford

method as well, to say the least, as by the multiplicity of varied "courses" which are so common with us.

But the Oxford teacher does not stop at this point. Even if the college did not bring its common life to bear upon the situation, he is inclined to maintain the thesis that the thorough study of some one field of knowledge, a study which proceeds to such a point that the man begins to feel a mastery of the subject and some confidence of his ability to handle himself in its realm, is the most valuable asset that education can give. Even if the subject matter to which a man has devoted the three years of his university career has no vital connection with the work of his subsequent life, the sense of mastery and the realization of definite attainment is the most desirable advantage that the university can afford. The teacher is frankly sceptical of the possibility of attaining such serviceable results from a course in which the student must jump nimbly from one lecture hall to another, in which Latin is considered at one hour, and chemistry at the next, and mathematics the third; with French and economics on the following day: in which he must in his work of preparation skip with equal agility from Livy to Einstein, from Kant to Keats. Concentration of effort should be the motto; the individual must steep himself in that one thing in which he is most interested, until his knowledge is of some avail. Such is the theory of Oxford. It may be that it is carried too far, but who can deny that the principle is valid?

As a matter of fact, some English educators do think that they have gone too far. Many are critical, for instance, of the degree of specialization which is required in the natural sciences. The effect of this objection is a bit marred by the fact that these critics are nearly all specialists in other realms of knowledge, and reject indignantly the suggestion that a modicum of science would be a good thing for the men under their charge. More to the point is the comment of the master of an important Oxford college who believes that the English system leaves out of consideration the type of man of high intellectual caliber for whom intense specialization is undesirable. Such a man might be better served by a course which should combine the exactions of the honors work with a wider choice of subjects than that course allows: something in principle not essentially different from the combinations of majors with required subjects which are applied, rather lamely it must be confessed, in many American

colleges. But most Oxford teachers are not of his mind. This question was put to many of them. What is the attitude of the university towards the man of brilliant mental attainments who honestly feels that the relative diffusion of the pass course is best fitted to his needs, and who proposes to devote to the work of that course the amount of effort which would give him a first in an honors school? The answer usually was that no such man exists; that high mental attainment and hard work are never associated, in the mind of anyone, with a pass degree. But if the question was still urged as a hypothetical one, the reply was that such a man would be subjected to advice amounting to extreme pressure that he should adopt a sane point of view; and that, as a last resource, direct compulsion would probably be imposed.

In general, it may be said that English teachers are convinced that the system which they have developed is, on the whole, satisfactory: and not only are the teachers thus convinced but the country at large is quite content with it. One is impressed with the confidence with which English faculties view the general principles under which they work as contrasted with the questioning attitude one finds among American educators: an attitude in the latter which extends not merely to the details but to the very essence of their system. The cynical observer may attribute this confidence to the self assurance which is sometimes considered to be a British characteristic. But the test to be applied to any educational system is, does it work? The English teacher believes that his system does answer that test. A foreign observer who inspects the system is not so sure that he is wrong.

With the application of the pass and honors system in mind, let us now return to the contrast between the methods employed by the older English universities and the American colleges in the treatment of the two classes of students who enter their walls: the man who is looking for the advantages which come from college contacts and the man whose interests are scholarly. At Oxford, through the pass and honors courses, these classes, in the past, have been sharply divided. The pass man lived the college life; the honors man did the intellectual work. This distinction is no longer quite true: the general tendency has been to force into the honors schools men whose scholarly interests are far from keen. But it has always been a guiding principle at Oxford that the man who does have the desire and capacity to profit from the intellectual advantages which the university can offer shall

be given every opportunity to carry his development to the farthest possible point. The university, it is true, does recognize an obligation to the unintellectual among the upper classes of England: it admits them under requirements that are not exacting, it tolerates them within its walls, it grants them degrees, and it troubles itself very little about them. But one thing under no stress does it ever do: it never permits their presence to interfere with the real training of men of promise. We, on the other hand, having to do with men of the same motives, concern ourselves strenuously to maintain a minimum standard, we strain ourselves to push and prod the unambitious and stupid to attain that standard, we set a goal for all which is not impossible of attainment for those low in the intellectual scale, we devote much of our energy to those who can never truly profit by it: but in all this strenuous endeavor we have not seen to it that men of high ability get from the opportunities of their college course all that they should.

Such is a fundamental difference between the English and American views of the duties of a university. Neither system is ideal; the weaknesses of each are apparent; weaknesses which are almost direct opposites. It should be obvious that each may gain from the study of the other something to its advantage.

Chapter XIV

OXFORD
METHODS OF INSTRUCTION
THE TUTORIAL SYSTEM. EXAMINATIONS

THE newest thing at Oxford is that which is frequently regarded as one of the oldest: the tutorial method of instruction. It is perhaps the most characteristic feature of Oxford, and as such is taken to be of hoary antiquity, but in its present form it dates only from the time of Jowett at Balliol in the middle of the nineteenth century. None the less it is a distinctive system; it has perhaps attracted more attention than any one feature of the Oxford method; and it is the only part of Oxford which has been more or less directly copied by certain institutions in America.

The theory of the tutorial system is education through companionship. Two men interested in a given field, one of them of considerable knowledge and experience, the other with very little, come together for the discussion of things of common interest. The older man serves, to a certain extent, as a guide; he outlines a desirable path to follow; he checks from his ripe experience vagaries into which the younger man may fall; he makes the way of the student easier than it would be if he had to traverse it alone. The relation is not supposed to be that of a pedagogue and pupil, but of two friends of common interests, who differ only in age and experience and who have in view the same goal. It is not a matter of direct and uniform method, of definite assignments and tests of accomplishments, as with us; but of two co-workers in a common field. Examinations must be passed, but the tutor is not placed in the position of preparing a man, directly and consciously, to meet their requirements. The intent is, rather, that through his own efforts, and with the friendly assistance of the tutor, the student shall acquire such range of knowledge and experience in his chosen field as to make any reasonable examination in it no special obstacle to him. Two men working together in close friendship and intimacy can accomplish much. That is the theory of the tutorial system.

Its machinery is fairly simple. When a student is enrolled in an Oxford college, and has selected the field in which he intends to work, he is assigned a tutor who specializes in that subject. He has no voice in the selection. The tutor thus assigned may remain with him through the whole of his university career, or, if there are in the college a number of tutors in that subject, he may be transferred from one to another as he enters upon phases of it in which a particular tutor is most interested. He usually meets his tutor once a week, almost always alone, for a conference of an hour. In order that there may be something to discuss he brings with him an essay covering some topic which has been agreed upon at a preceding conference. This essay is read and then follows—or is supposed to follow—a discussion upon themes suggested by it.

The stress placed by Oxford upon written work, and particularly upon literary style, can hardly be overestimated. It is one of the features of the Oxford system which most troubles the American student who comes to the English university with habits formed in his home college. When he submits his first essay and finds that his tutor is much disturbed by the occurrence of the same word twice in a single sentence, or too many words ending in ion on a page, he is frankly puzzled. Those words express what he wants to say, the meaning is clear, so why worry more about it? But his tutor persists in his objection to slip-shod English, and eventually the student finds it convenient so to care for the way in which he expresses his ideas as to make that no longer a source of friction. Even English critics object to this stress as overemphasized, and complain that Oxford is more interested in how a thing is said than she is in what is said. Some even go so far as to say that the aim is not a good literary style, but a certain stereotyped Oxford style; and anything that deviates from it for that reason is considered bad. Such a view surely is extreme. But it may be fairly said that Oxford values most highly literary finish; and, moreover, that by her insistence upon it does succeed in developing in her students a greater felicity and ease of expression than is common in the graduates of most universities.

What does the tutor expect of the student in these weekly conferences? Again the Oxford undergraduate with American training encounters a real shock. At home he was given definite assignments, he studied his lesson with the object of learning what the text book said, and he spilled it forth, when called upon, with

as little change as possible. He found that his scholastic success in college depended on how successfully he followed that process. He tries the same method at Oxford and finds, to his astonishment, that his tutor takes not the slightest interest in his mastery of the facts; such information is taken for granted, but that he is expected to give his own ideas upon the subject in question. As very likely, he never had an idea in his life, and as he had never been encouraged to form one, he is much perturbed at the situation and much disgusted at Oxford and its ways. A Fellow of Balliol, who has had much to do with American students, gives this as his experience. At first the youth brings facts to his tutor: then, when this will not do, he searches sedulously for the comments and criticisms of others, he laboriously works them up and produces them in triumph. When he finds that this process is of no more avail than the other, that his own ideas are all that will fit the case, he explodes with exasperation and says that his American teachers would classify such stuff as "hot air." But when it is evident that the job must be done and that he must set himself to the novel task of forming conclusions of his own, he finds, after a time, to his astonishment, that these conclusions are neither so vaporous nor so heated as he had expected. Then it is that the Oxford method begins to impress itself upon him in its real strength. The Oxford critic of American education considers its greatest defect to be that it centers its efforts on the absorption by the student of specific information on definitely limited topics, without a grasp on the thing as a whole. This weakness Oxford tries to avoid, and, it must be said, it measurably succeeds in the task.

Of course, the advantage is not all one way. Neither the tutor nor anyone else puts much pressure on the student to follow the suggested path. Advice is given, weaknesses are pointed out, but any measure of compulsion is practically absent. If the student's own conscience or ambition do not prod him to accomplishment, nothing else does. As a result, it is perfectly easy to live at Oxford a life of luxurious and pleasant idleness, without arousing the protest of the powers that be. Such opportunities are by no means neglected. It is a common criticism by the English themselves that the almost entire freedom from restraint in things scholastic is harmful to the Oxford student. Such a system would certainly be unworkable in an American college.

University teaching plays a relatively unimportant part in the work of Oxford. It is true that there are many university professors, and that such a title is considered a high honor by English educators. The incumbents of these chairs give courses of lectures which are open to all the members of the university. A tutor usually recommends his students to attend such of these lectures as are pertinent to their work. They do attend at the start, and continue so to do if the subject is attractive and the lecturer is interesting. But they are under no obligation to go, and many of them very soon drop out. It is possible to do well at Oxford and receive her degree with no more than an occasional visit to the lecture room. Of course in the natural sciences the matter is a bit different. University laboratories exist, and much of the work is done in them. Even here some of the colleges maintain laboratories of their own, with the various branches of the work so divided among them as to avoid undue duplication. In general it may be said that university teaching plays a surprisingly small part in the life of the institution. The movement which at Cambridge and London has made notable progress—that the university shall assume in the course of time practically all the teaching functions of the institution as well as those of setting examinations and granting degrees—has made much less progress at Oxford.

Such is the system of instruction under which Oxford works. The principle behind it has obvious merits. What are its disadvantages, as applied?

In the first place it is expensive. No institution except one of great wealth can hope to maintain individual instruction to the extent which Oxford does. Even there the strain is beginning to be felt The most obvious modification, which would seem to meet this difficulty, is an arrangement for meetings in small groups instead of with single individuals. But such a method seems to be in conflict with the essential principle of the system—that the contacts shall be single, one man with his tutor. As a matter of fact, the plan of group tutoring would seem to have one striking advantage: it would bring into play a wider range of knowledge and of ideas than can come from a meeting between two men. The discussion which can be stimulated in a group of five is likely to be more effective than that between one student and his tutor. But Oxford, in general, will not hear of this modification, except as an addition to the method now in vogue.

It is felt that the whole spirit of the tutorial system depends upon intimate contact between tutor and student, and the feeling of friendship and intimacy which such a contact should insure. It is not thought possible that such a result can be obtained except by man-to-man talks between the two. So the idea of group discussion is not received with favor. Nevertheless, under the force of circumstances it has become necessary in some colleges for two students to have a tutorial hour in common, and there is some evidence that this policy, for financial reasons, will have to be more generally adopted in the future.

Of course, a tutorial system is best adapted to a narrow curriculum: one in which the number of subjects covered, and therefore the number of tutors with given specialties to be provided, is not large. The very existence of the tutorial method would seem to be a bar to any large extension of the curriculum. If each college is to be independent in its teaching, the addition of any subject would mean the provision of a new tutor in each of the twenty-one Oxford colleges. It does not work out that way because intercollegiate exchanges and other arrangements make for efficient administration. Notwithstanding this obvious handicap, the curriculum of Oxford has been extended so that it is quite abreast of the times. But, despite all arrangements that can be made, there is reason to believe that the smaller and poorer Oxford colleges will in the future find it difficult to maintain the minimum effective tutorial staff which is required in these days of expansion of the subject matter of education. Even now it seems necessary that a given tutor shall spread himself over a much wider field than is entirely desirable.

The work of the tutor himself, although in many ways delightful, is not altogether without its drawbacks. The average number of hours per week which each Oxford don devotes to his tutorial work is thirty. The American college teacher, who regards twelve class room hours as an extreme imposition, is quite unable to believe that such things can be. Nor is the work easy. It is certainly as much of a mental strain to wrestle with the "essay" of the average youth, and to try to derive from it and from him some material for "discussion," as it is to conduct an ordinary class. Moreover, the tutor sometimes has four of these hours in succession. It is quite easy to believe the statement made by an Oxford don that if any inspiration or enthusiasm came in his fourth tutorial hour, it would have to come from the

boy himself. Nor is it easy, even when the tutor is fresh, to supply stimulating guidance on the basis of the dull production of a dull youth who does not want to learn. The material for discussion is likely to be exhausted before the hour is more than well under way. It is no wonder that much of the work is perfunctory; that, after the reading of the essay, the wearied man dismisses the student with a few commonplace remarks, and tries to renew his energies for the ordeal of the next hour in whatever way he has found to be most effective. Original work, serious study, both seem to be impossible to the man laboring under the burden of teaching. The sympathy of the American teacher grows more and more touching as this story is told, until, as an anti-climax, comes the information that the number of weeks in the year in which this process is kept up is twenty. Then things do not seem quite so bad.

The enthusiasm of the student for the tutorial system is not excessive. A friendly, sympathetic relationship is supposed to be involved. But two men, to be friends, must have between them certain elements of congeniality, which can hardly be assumed to result from their being thrown together by assignment from above. There are some teachers who form friends among their students under whatever system they work: there are others who would fail to make them under the most favorable auspices. So, if under the Oxford system, men of the former class have unusual opportunities to make their charm effective, the men of the other class are under unusual handicaps from the fact that they lack that charm. The advantage to a student of coming in contact, through his tutorial hours, with a congenial, sympathetic teacher is great; but the requirement of personal contact makes the disadvantage equally great should that teacher be uncongenial and unsympathetic. The comments of the Oxford student concerning his tutors do not seem essentially different from student comment in other lands. One man complains that his tutor follows no set plan, that the direction is helter-skelter rather than well ordered: another feels that, while the system of his studies is well ordered, the tutor is a positive hindrance in the pursuit of the goal; another asserts that, while the tutor is a most pleasant and companionable gentleman, his knowledge of the subject matter of his specialty is not profound; another believes that, while his tutor could be efficient if he wished, he is lazy and unambitious. Of course, there are those who are

perfectly satisfied with the results, and feel that they are profiting much by the relationship. In fact, the judgment of the student as to Oxford itself is likely to depend very largely on this one factor; has he or has he not a congenial and competent tutor. On the whole, despite the purpose of the system to the contrary, there seems no convincing evidence which leads one to believe that the Oxford student regards his tutor in a way essentially different from the way in which those taught regard those who teach the world over.

Oxford itself looks upon the tutorial system as a success. The opinion of educators in the rest of England is not so unanimous in its favor. There are many who look upon it as far from satisfactory. Many of these critics are graduates of Oxford; some, even, have been Oxford teachers. They call attention to its expense; an expense unwarranted by its results. They object to the amount of time devoted to the education of the mediocre and indifferent; time, however, spent in a manner which is perfunctory and ineffective. They point to the lack of real discussion such as could be obtained from a group. They criticise the strain imposed on the tutor and claim that it is without due compensating result. They call attention to all the weaknesses which have been mentioned above. Their final judgment is that the system is extravagant and ineffective.

When English educators differ so widely, it is hardly possible for an American to come to a definite conclusion. There is no question that the tutorial system, or something like it, should work well with ambitious and gifted students. There is considerable doubt whether the expense of its application to the mediocre is warranted by the results. American experiments in its application are interesting and will be discussed later. But whatever conclusion may be reached in the abstract, it seems apparent that those features of Oxford which most commend themselves to the American observer can well be fitted to a college system in which the tutorial method does not play so large a part.

Examinations

It is the general custom in the English universities to set more stress on the formal examination than is the case with us. The examination system, from the school up, is worked out with care and is well co-ordinated. Formerly the principle of external

examinations was general: examinations set and graded by a board which had nothing to do with the teaching of the students examined. The unfairness of this system was so evident that it is now practically extinct. Nevertheless, the boards which have to do with the examinations practically always contain one or more members who come from a different institution. These external examiners never constitute a majority of the board: the men who do the teaching of the students have really complete control: but the assistance of a teacher who is not in the university itself is considered to be indispensable.

At Oxford, as has been said, the only tests to which the student is subject in his quest for the degree are the three examinations: responsions (or its equivalent), almost always taken before entrance; moderations, at the end of the first year in the university; and the second public examination, at the end of the course. As three years in the university are required by statute, and as four are frequently taken in the honors courses, the student spends his last two or three years in the preparation for a final examination, and is subject to no formal test at all during that period. The pass examinations cover material that is fairly definite and circumscribed: the honors examinations are supposed to test the student on his mastery and grasp of the subject as a whole: they are intended to be comprehensive in a true sense. In the honors schools an oral test supplements the written one. This test is usually perfunctory and only assumes importance in the case of the men who are to be considered for "firsts" and those about whom there is some doubt as to the particular class in which they shall fall. There seems to be little tendency in England to utilize the psychological test, or the type of examination developed from it: methods which are now so much a matter of interest to us.

A system which places entire stress upon the examination may work well or it may work very poorly. The crucial question is: does the student prepare himself by obtaining so thorough a grasp on the subject that the particular questions which will come on the examination are a matter of indifference; or does he devote extreme ingenuity to the attempt to forecast what is likely to be asked, and prepare himself by intensive cramming on those topics. In other words, does he study for the purpose of learning, or does he study for the purpose of passing an examination? It is usually easy to determine the efficiency of the examination

system of a university by observing the number and the financial prosperity of the "cramming schools" and "private tutors" in its environs. These institutions and individuals—whose success is not, as is sometimes thought, due to their teaching skill, but to their ability in forecasting what the examination will be—are justly considered a great nuisance in academic life. The blame, however, should not be assigned to them, but to conditions in the university which allow their work to be effective. If they are numerous and successful, it always means that the examination system in that institution is either on a wrong basis, or—and this is more likely—is improperly handled. Any teacher, if he will take the trouble, can prepare an examination which will be a perfectly fair test, but which will make the work of the crammer utterly ineffective.

Private tutors at Oxford are not unknown. Some of them are very successful. Their very presence is an indication that the official tutor will not lend himself to the process of cramming. There is some evidence that these extraneous individuals are less abundant than they formerly were. Nevertheless, in one Oxford college it was shown that seventy or eighty per cent of the honors students in a certain subject, rather technical in its nature, have constant recourse to the crammer. It was the opinion of an Oxford student who was specializing in another subject that it is fairly easy to predict what would be the precise nature of a large number of questions on its honors examination. A man whose interests lie in still another field felt that there such prediction is quite impossible. So it goes. Various departments differ as to the efficiency of the examination process. But on the whole it seems evident that Oxford succeeds reasonably well by its honors examinations in requiring in its students a general control of the field in which they are working, rather than specific information on limited parts of it. It seems to succeed, if not entirely, at least better than most American institutions, in making its tests such that nothing but that general grasp and broad control will answer the purpose.

Chapter XV

OXFORD

Athletics

THE attitude of the older English universities towards athletics has long been held up to American colleges as an ideal desirable to follow. In truth, there is much in the athletic life of Oxford that is attractive. In particular, the general participation in sports by a large portion of the student body is admirable. To one who views Oxford on a spring afternoon it seems as if everyone is engaged in some athletic activity. The institution has long ago reached the goal at which many American universities are aiming. Incidentally it may be said that such a movement is meeting with marked success in some of our colleges. The condition under which a few men play games, and all the rest watch, in them no longer represents the athletic situation. More and more, general participation in athletics is being secured. It is being recognized by college authorities that, if facilities for sport are provided, such facilities will be utilized; and in many institutions, so located that land values are not prohibitive, the activities of the student body on a spring afternoon are not essentially different from those in the older English universities. Nor is the growth of winter sport the least encouraging feature of the situation. But Oxford enjoys many peculiar advantages. The climate is such that outdoor games can be played the year round. Most of the colleges have fields and club houses of their own. Nearly all of them have their barges on the river. The college system lends itself, as no other can, to active intra-mural competition. With twenty competitors (All Souls with four undergraduates can hardly be reckoned in) the number of different competitions will obviously be large. The regular college teams are not enough: scrub teams are organized and play any opponent whom they can secure. So on a college playing field one may observe a game of cricket between an organization of students, membership in which—so the innocent visitor is told—depends upon an ability to get thoroughly drunk before each contest and still be able to play, and a team from

the Oxford police. The Isis, a stream so insignificant to the American eye, is thronged with oarsmen. One almost begins to believe, as he views them in May, that on it and on the Cam, are more racing crews than are supported by all the colleges in America. If any one in Oxford wishes to engage in sports—and most men do—there is no lack of incentive or opportunity.

Nor is Oxford troubled with many of the problems which vex the athletic authorities of an American college. There are few questions of eligibility, and no effort to make sure that the athlete shall do a reasonable amount of scholastic work. There is no proselyting of students in the lower schools, with the attempt, by fair means or otherwise, to turn their paths to a given university. The question of amateur status does not arise, because the professional element is absent. No pressure is put on a man to "come out for the team," if his own inclinations do not lead him to do so; and there is no particular idea that the successful athlete is "doing something for the university." The games themselves are less strenuous. The American student who puts into them the vim which is required of him at home is likely, to his complete astonishment, to be accused of rough and dirty playing. In other words, the idea that sport is a pleasurable exercise and not a mild form of warfare is more prevalent than with us. The segregation of athletes in colleges of little scholastic reputation may, to a certain extent, be observed, but it is a curious fact that the colleges of the highest intellectual pretences—colleges which select their men with regard only to their scholastic promise—hold their own quite well in many branches of sport.

It is not to be assumed, however, that the athlete is not a man of prestige at Oxford. The fame of the "old blue" is secure, and his is a reputation which lasts through life. In the obituary notice of a former athletic hero, no matter how far back may have been his college days and no matter what may have been the accomplishments of his subsequent years, his achievements in the university field of sport are never forgotten. In a recent election for a member of parliament for the city of Oxford, much was made of the fact that both the leading candidates were "old blues." But the point at which the spirit of Oxford differs from that of an American college is that a prestige may be obtained from scholastic success equal to that gained from athletic achievements. The stroke of the varsity crew is certainly

a man of fame, but so is the man who achieves a first in "greats." Still it is true that the mind of the university dwells much in the realms of sport. Nor is it entirely certain, as is commonly thought, that Oxford and Cambridge play the game for the sake of the game, without much worry as to the side on which victory will rest. One who walks the streets of London on the night of a university boat race might well imagine himself in Boston or in New Haven. The winners seem quite as jubilant and the losers quite as depressed as they are in an American environment.

But after all is said and done, the varied aspect of university sport in America and England depends upon the vital difference in the social systems of the two countries. As a result, the difference is deep-seated and fundamental. Conclusions based on superficial observations are dangerous, but impressions gained in that way may be given for what they are worth. The impression which one gets from casual contacts with the English lower classes—particularly with the mill and factory workers—is that their attitude toward sport is most disheartening, and on the whole in marked contrast to the attitude of the same classes at home. Every interest in sport seems to be dependent on the gambling instinct, and that contest most attracts attention which best serves as an opportunity of placing bets. When this feeling is unrestrained by the inhibitions which come from the training of the gentleman, it leads to scenes of rowdyism and bad sportmanship which are much less common at home: such scenes as may be observed at the great matches of the English professional football teams. The one sport which unites all classes in England is horse racing. The Englishman prides himself on his love of the horse. No doubt it exists, but one is inclined dogmatically to assert that the one purpose of English racing is to serve as a basis for gambling. If an individual rides, just before the Derby, in a third class railway compartment with a group of workmen, and listens to their discussion of pools and sweepstakes, to the trading of tickets, and the chaffering and quarreling over it, he is under no illusions as to what sport means to that group. And if he sits in the lounge of an English residential hotel and hears the conversation of its clientele—men of moderate but independent means, and their wives and daughters—he finds its trend, minus the nauseating vulgarity of the lower classes, to be much the same. Newspaper comment, extending to columns of astonished and rather reluctant approval, on the fact that the

owner of the Derby winner of 1924 (the Earl of Derby himself) has never in his racing career placed a bet, confirms the impression. There is gambling enough in America: there is enough, in particular, in connection with intercollegiate contests: but we can congratulate ourselves that its general development has never attained the proportions that it has in England.

But this depressing condition of sport among the lower classes brings with it certain compensations in its effect on the university. The gentleman is thoroughly differentiated from the individual who is not. The attitude called for by his class status must be fundamentally apart from that assumed by those of a lower condition of life. These conditions place university sport on a plane by itself. Moreover, the members of these lower classes, perfectly conscious of their social position and quite content with it (save perhaps from an economic point of view), take no particular interest in what the university man is doing. The latter may be as much of a gambler in heart as the former, but there are certain requirements of his position, and a certain attitude of mind resulting both from his position and his training, which make his outlook on sport utterly different from that of the people at large. So the university man runs his athletic contests for his own benefit, for his own amusement, and in his own way. In doing so he develops that condition of things which the American observer of English university athletics so much admires. There are no great stadia, no enormous athletic incomes, no complicated business organizations, no army of highly paid professional coaches and trainers. Whatever expenses are incurred are paid by the individual student from his own pocket. There is no sporting page predominantly devoted to college athletics. The newspapers do assign space to university races and matches, but it is small compared to that given to professional football, and infinitely less than that devoted to horse racing. In other words, the English university is playing games for its own amusement, and not running a sporting hippodrome for the entertainment of the public at large.

This seems, to one observer at least, the fundamental difference between the English and American systems of university athletics. If, with us, public interest in college sport should be removed, there seems little reason to believe that the athletic situation would assume a form at all unlike that which we find at Oxford and Cambridge. The general interest at home depends

upon a social system utterly different from that which prevails abroad. There the gentleman, as a rigidly defined class, is sharply marked off from the rest of the community, and neither class, as a whole, aspires to imitate the other: here everybody assumes that he is a gentleman, and many of all classes are. The English social system, when applied to the university, makes its athletics seem reasonable and easily managed: our own social system applied to our university athletics must inevitably produce results which make them seem misplaced and monstrously overgrown. It is obvious that thereby our colleges are confronted with a most difficult problem; one which cannot be solved to the entire satisfaction of anyone: but it should be equally obvious that it certainly cannot be solved by neglecting the factors which are at its foundation by the attempt to imitate a system in which those factors are quite different. When we consider all aspects of the matter, the interests of the community and of the college as its servant, are we sure that the conditions which we find in America, unsatisfactory as many of them are, should not be regarded with as much optimism as those which prevail in England? At any rate, if we are to train our leaders to take that sane point of view concerning sport which the English gentleman is supposed to possess, we must most carefully guard against those who are not leaders being allowed to fall into the depressing attitude which seems to be characteristic of the English rank and file.

In conclusion, it is not without interest to know that the system of Oxford and Cambridge, which has so long been held up to American institutions as an example of a well balanced division between things of the body and the mind, is regarded by many of those connected with the provincial universities, and with those of Scotland, as a huge over-development and over-emphasis of things essentially trivial. Truly the place to which one will get depends much on the point at which he starts.

Chapter XVI

CAMBRIDGE

THE prevailing spirit of the two older English universities is much the same. Nor are their organizations essentially different. Attempts are made, it is true, to draw distinctions between them: distinctions which are apt to be fine-spun and subtle. Thus Dr. McLean of the American University Union, in his report on the English university system, classifies Oxford as progressive-conservative and Cambridge as conservative-progressive. How great a distinction this may be seems inversely proportional to the stress given to the first adjective of each pair. Matthew Arnold considered Cambridge to be the mother of great men; Oxford the mother of great movements: while Lord Roseberry maintains that Oxford has the traditional and reverential, Cambridge the inquiring and testing spirit. The intentionally exaggerated comments of the members of one university on the other—bantering remarks always exchanged by friendly rivals—are not without value to one desirous of forming a judgment of the essential nature of the institutions. Oxford speaks of Cambridge as a bit grubby and utilitarian, given to an overplus of numbers, and lacking the high tone which it claims for itself. Cambridge considers Oxford to be pretentious, pompous and superficial; interested in form rather than in substance; in expression rather than in ideas. It turns out journalists, politicians, sometimes statesmen; while Cambridge supplies poets and scholars—and tends to furnish Oxford with her most learned professors. Such comments, of course, are not intended to be taken at their face value, but they give some indication of whatever difference may exist.

Of course externally each university has an individuality of its own. It is difficult to say which has the greater charm. Perhaps the more extensive use of brick in its buildings, and the better quality of stone where that is employed, gives to Cambridge less of the atmosphere of hoary antiquity than is characteristic of Oxford. Nor has Cambridge any street whose effect on the visitor is so overwhelming as is that of High Street in Oxford.

On the other hand Oxford has nothing like the "backs" of Cambridge, nor has she, or any other university, a structure which can match in architectural splendor the chapel of Kings College. It has been said that the visitor is most impressed with the university which he sees last. It is not so certain that the effect is not the other way: that the institution of the two which he sees first, with its impression on a mind unprepared for the impact, produces a glamor which the charm of the other can never replace nor weaken.

There is an essential difference in the direction of interest of the two universities. Oxford has always maintained the study of the classics, both from a linguistic standpoint and from that of their content, as the center of her system. Cambridge, on the other hand, early developed a taste for mathematics, and from that, by easy gradations, an interest in the natural sciences. The institution which early numbered among its great teachers Sir Isaac Newton today maintains that prestige by such men as Sir Joseph Thompson and Sir Ernest Rutherford. It is safe to say that in certain branches of physics the leadership of Cambridge is undisputed. Oxford has never had a special prestige in science. This difference of subject matter is, perhaps, the most obvious dividing line between the two universities.

The college system is much the same as at Oxford. The number of colleges—seventeen*—is somewhat less, but as the total enrollment of the university is considerably more, the average membership of each college is larger than at the sister institution. In fact some Cambridge men are of the opinion that these numbers are so large as to handicap the colleges in the utilization of their system to its full advantage. Differences in wealth and prestige of the various colleges bring about the same condition as at Oxford, in a form which may be even more extreme. Thus Trinity, with over seven hundred students—nearly double that of any other college—enjoys a position of leadership which is unquestioned. Its prestige may be illustrated by the doggerel rhyme current in Cambridge.

"When you through the realms of space shall have travelled
And the nebulous films to the utmost unravelled,
You will find, when you tread on the bounds of infinity,
That God's greatest work is the Master of Trinity."

*In addition there are eleven associated institutions, including a hall for non-collegiate students, five theological colleges, and two colleges for women.

Truly the Master of Trinity is a mighty man and his college is so entrenched by wealth and by reputation that it overshadows many of its rivals. In general, Cambridge men, not excepting those connected with Trinity itself, consider these conditions to be unfortunate for the interests of the university as a whole.

College government is a favorite topic of the teacher of Oxford and Cambridge in his discussions with his American friends. With a measure of that satisfaction which every Englishman feels in showing that the practical applications of democracy in his supposedly aristocratic land are more complete than in our boasted republic, this question was brought up in conversation at Trinity. It was pointed out that here, as in all Cambridge colleges, the teaching body is supreme not only in matters strictly educational, but in the management of college finance, and in appointments to the staff. Much sympathy was expressed with the American teacher, who was pictured as laboring under the tyranny of trustee government. A perfectly innocent question—by whom is the Master of Trinity appointed?—caused momentary confusion. It developed that he is selected by the crown. The picture of a similar potentate in America—let us say the Dean of Columbia College—depending for his position upon appointment by the President of the United States, subject, probably, to confirmation by the Senate, is not without its element of humor. But, in all fairness, it must be admitted that this survival of an aristocratic tradition modifies hardly at all the real democracy of the institution. It is perfectly correct to say that the teaching body of a college does run its own affairs, with no serious interference from anyone.

The idea of the college trustee remains an obsession in the mind of the English educator. It is an idea which might well be based on the productions of Mr. Upton Sinclair, whose reliability and authority as an educational expert seem to be regarded a bit more seriously abroad than they are at home. Of course there are good trustees and bad trustees: and the baleful effects of the latter, as applied to college policy, are too obvious to require comment. But when pains were taken to picture the other type—the man who, having attained prominence in his chosen calling, nevertheless is willing to devote time and money to the service of his college; who recognizes his lack of acquaintance with educational problems and who meddles not at all with them; who devotes that energy and keen ability, which have made him

successful in his chosen work, to the material affairs of the institution; who thereby helps make possible those educational advances which seem essential to the teaching body; and who does this with no reward save the satisfaction of his obligation to his alma mater—when such a picture of the trustee was placed before the English teachers it was evidently to them a new and strange vision. They were free to confess that he had no exact counterpart in their educational system, and that he was not entirely without his good points. Quite as new to them was the reliance of the American college on alumni support. The fact that an institution could, to a reasonable extent, overrun calculated income in the introduction of essential improvements, and could count, from year to year, on alumni gifts to do away with the deficit thus caused, was regarded as highly commendable. In fact, this feature of the American system was the one thing which the English educator seems willing to adopt from us quite unchanged.

Admission to the Cambridge college is on much the same basis as at Oxford. "Previous examinations" (similar to responsions) are required by nearly all the colleges, but there is no university rule to that effect. In addition to this test, many colleges give entrance examinations of their own. The field in these special examinations is not extended beyond that in the previous examinations, and they serve simply as an additional check. The subjects in previous examinations are as follows:

I. Two languages, one being Latin or Greek, carried to an advanced stage; or one language, either Latin or Greek, so carried, and two others to an elementary stage.
II. Elementary mathematics and either advanced mathematics or physics or chemistry.
III. English and either Bible study or English history.

As at Oxford, these requirements do not seem to be as difficult in quality nor as great in quantity as our entrance examinations. But, of course, the great majority of students bring with them much more than this minimum. We have again the story of students of varied degrees of preparation working at what seems to be the same stage.

In spirit, the division into pass and honors courses is like that at Oxford. There are, however, interesting deviations in detail. For the "poll" or ordinary degree, new regulations have just been

put into operation. In accordance with them, the candidate must qualify in five subjects, three of which are principal and two subsidiary. The principal subject must be carried through three terms and an examination must be passed in it; the subsidiary subject is carried through two terms and only a certificate of attendance is required. Both principal and subsidiary subjects are divided into two groups, the first of which includes the languages and the social sciences; the second, mathematics and the natural sciences. Of principal subjects there are twenty-two in group one and thirteen in group two. The nature of the subsidiary subjects is interesting. It seems to represent the only tendency toward comprehensive courses to be found in Great Britain. The list is as follows:

Group I

British Empire in the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Centuries.
History of Geographical Discovery.
History of English Drama.
Industry and Agriculture since 1800.

Group II

Sound, Light and Wireless Waves.
The Weather.
Prehistoric Man.
Problems of Industry.

Groups I and II

Gothic Architecture.
History and Science of Polar Exploration.

The only requirement as to election is that one subject, either principal or subsidiary, must be taken from each group. Cambridge has no examinations corresponding to moderations; the tests in the principal subjects may be taken at any regular period at which the student is ready for them, and are thus scattered through the course. Unlike the practice at Oxford, classes (three in number) are given as a result of these examinations.

It is evident that the "poll" course gives a wide and unhampered variety of choice, with full opportunity to concentrate on those things selected. Except for the subsidiary courses, which seem to be rather perfunctory in their nature, the student has at his disposal a full year's time for each of his selected subjects. In general, Cambridge regards her pass course as one which is taken much more seriously, both by student and by

teacher, than is the corresponding course at Oxford. Some Cambridge teachers even go so far as to say that a good pass degree is better than the lowest class in honors, but this is not the general opinion. The same tendency to influence men towards the specialization of the honors degree is noted here as elsewhere. Nevertheless, it is a notable fact that of the men students at Cambridge forty-two per cent take the pass degree, while only fourteen per cent do so at Oxford.

The honors courses or "triposes" are fourteen in number. They are similar to those at Oxford save in one particular. With two exceptions, all examinations in these courses are divided into two parts. The general rule is that the two parts must be passed separately before the degree is awarded, but it is not always necessary that both parts be in the same tripos. A student who wishes to do so may take his first examination in one tripos and his second in another. So far as possible it is arranged that the second part of the tripos does not depend on the information obtained in the first. Of course this method cannot be applied to all subjects. In moral sciences, natural sciences and theology the first part alone is sufficient for the degree and requires the full three years: a student taking the second part must return after graduation to do it, and he gets no further degree as a result of his extra work. But in many cases there is opportunity for the honors student to diversify his work to a greater extent than he can at Oxford.

The widest difference between the two universities is in the method of instruction. Lectures do count at Cambridge: they are in fact the center of the student's work. He does attend formal courses, and whatever tutorial instruction is given, is on the basis of these lectures. Moreover, the university assumes a large share in the teaching. All the instruction in the natural sciences, together with the care and the maintenance of the laboratories, is under the direction of the university. There are many university lecturers in other subjects and their work is utilized by the students to the fullest extent. In addition, there are many college lecturers whose courses are open to the whole student body: there are other cases in which colleges combine to give courses which are freely open to undergraduates of those particular institutions: and finally there yet remain some lectures which are purely collegiate, and to which students of other colleges are not admitted. But the general method at Cambridge

is instruction in formal courses; and the movement already mentioned by which the university shall assume all teaching functions is there well under way.

Individual instruction, however, is not neglected. The Cambridge tutor has quite different duties from those of his Oxford namesake: he is a college officer whose functions closely correspond to those of the deans of American colleges. He has some two hundred students under his charge, he advises them as to courses, and he has disciplinary authority, but, as tutor, he does no teaching. The individual attention given by the tutor at Oxford is here the work of the preceptor. Each teacher who lectures is supposed also to do preceptorial work: he meets each of twenty or twenty-five men in his course for an individual weekly conference of half an hour. The object of these meetings is to discuss the work of the course, to listen to assigned essays, and otherwise to supplement the formal instruction. In a large course, the teacher will have to assist him other preceptors, some of whom may do no lecturing at all. Or the lecturer, if he is a sufficiently important man, may give over all this work to subordinates. But each student, according to his needs, does receive individual attention. The system is not so formalized as at Oxford, but is sufficiently elastic to fit the case to which it is to be applied. Thus, in one college, the mathematical preceptors meet the students only to assign them problems and to take the solutions of those which have been given out the week before. This process can be followed because that particular college admits only students in mathematics whose ability is high. Mathematical preceptors in other colleges treat the problem quite differently. In science there is no preceptorial instruction except for the weaker men; the laboratory work is supposed to take care of the rest. In other departments the meetings are by groups, and in still others, where that method is found most effective, the procedure is much like that at Oxford. On the whole, there seems good reason to believe that the individual instruction at Cambridge is both adequate and sensibly applied.

In one respect Cambridge is unique: it is the only university in Great Britain which refuses admission to women on equal terms with men. Oxford, after a long struggle, finally capitulated to the trend of the times, and now admits women to all rights and privileges of the university. There are not so very many

of them, but through the fact that they seem to move in droves, one whose ideas of the old university have been formed by reading *Tom Brown* is somewhat amazed at the appearance of so much femininity in her classic halls. He goes to Cambridge with the conviction that things will be different there, and his amazement is increased by finding nearly as much of the feminine element as at Oxford. An examination of the situation brings the explanation. There are two women's colleges in Cambridge, with nearly five hundred students between them. They have been in existence for fifty years. Their students are admitted on terms of equality with men (subject to certain reservations of control by colleges, etc.) to lectures, laboratories, and examinations. They are even allowed, after graduation, to vote for the university representatives in parliament. But two things Cambridge has stubbornly refused to grant them. They cannot be matriculated in the university, and they do not receive degrees, but only "titles to degrees"—a subtle distinction not easy to grasp and probably not worth grasping.

The situation seems truly British in its complexity. One is inclined to ask the advocates of co-education why they should worry about unessentials, having gained all that really counts: or to ask those opposed to it why, having permitted co-education to grow up in the place, they boggle about such trivialities as matriculation and "titles to degrees." But the real difficulty seems to be one of university administration, and the determination of university policy. The teachers in the women's colleges now have no official status, they have nothing to say concerning university policy, they can hold no university offices. Moreover the graduates of the women's colleges are not entitled to vote, as are other graduates, on the great questions which agitate the institution. The majority of those entitled to decide the matter—including the country squires and parsons—have always felt that this was exactly the position which they should occupy. It is a curious fact that those members of the university roll who are engaged in university teaching at Cambridge and who, therefore, are most concerned in the matter, have always consistently voted the other way. Even a picture of feminine vice-chancellor and feminine proctors wandering the streets at night to herd in unruly undergraduates was not one to daunt them. But the majority has always been on the other side, and so we have a university which accords its privileges to women but will not recognize completely the fact that it has done so.

The Royal Commission of 1922 could not look on this condition with favor. It did not seem right to award public money to an institution which persisted in excluding half the citizens of the community. So it set up, as one of the conditions for the receipt of state subsidy, a requirement of the opening of the university to women. But a majority of the body was sympathetic with the idea of keeping the institution a men's university. It recommended, therefore, that Cambridge be allowed to limit its women students to five hundred, and that women should not be eligible to certain administrative offices and professorships. But the more radical members of the commission, sternly consistent and strictly logical, would hear of no such compromise. In a minority report they demanded that in every respect women should be on terms of equality with men. It will be interesting to see what the university will do with these recommendations.

Chapter XVII

THE UNIVERSITY OF LONDON

ONE who goes from Oxford or Cambridge to London finds himself at once in a different atmosphere. No longer is he in a town permeated by the charm of university life: no longer does he feel himself in a community whose interest has always centered in a historic institution, and which has held itself aloof from the busy affairs of the world. Instead he finds scattered over a great city the individual units of a university, immersed in its urban life, and partaking in some measure in its activity, eager to forecast the educational tendencies of the times and to respond to their demands. The charm and glamor of long standing tradition are lacking. But keenness, alertness, and above all, efficiency prevail.

It is probable that any reasonably intelligent man, if he will exert himself sufficiently, can arrive at an understanding of the organization of the University of London: that he can eventually discover what things the university does, what are the degrees of affiliation of its various subsidiary branches, what is the relationship between the parts of the cumbersome whole. It is equally probable that no intelligent person will take that trouble unless there exists some vital necessity for him to do so. Fortunately for the purpose of this investigation, that necessity is lacking, and we may be content with a merely superficial glance at the structure of the institution.

Development of the University

London was founded as a protest against three tendencies of the older universities: the narrow range of their curricula, their theological exclusiveness, and their expense. Many men of eminence were interested in the new organization, but at the heart of the movement were the leaders of the dissenting churches, the members of which were shut out of the old universities by the imposition of various theological tests. As many denominations were represented among the founders, the solution of the question

of religious instruction was the same as that which prevails in America—that there should be none at all. The University was organized as a joint stock company, it obtained its capital by subscription, it acquired a site at Gower Street—the present home of University College—and opened its doors for students in 1828. Then came the struggle for a charter.

Many people who viewed with sympathy two of the objects of the new college were shocked by the third; the absence of religious instruction. They were willing to back their opinions with their money, and so, in 1829, a rival institution, Kings College, was opened. It was precisely like the University, except in the requirement of a theological test for admission, and of religious instruction in the curriculum. Obviously, it was not easy to reconcile such interests in such violent conflict, and to hit upon a compromise by which degree-granting rights should be obtained. Moreover, Oxford and Cambridge stood watchfully in a strategic position, ready to throw rocks in the machinery whenever a favorable opportunity was presented. It was not until 1836 that a compromise was agreed upon and a plan devised, which, although much modified in the intervening years, has much to do with the character of the University today.

According to this scheme, the institution which had existed as the University of London was chartered as University College. A similar charter was granted to Kings College. Neither was given the right of awarding degrees. Over them both was imposed an institution called the University of London, to which was intrusted the power to set and to grade the examinations and to grant degrees. It was originally planned that the University should prescribe courses and admit to its examinations only those who had obtained certificates from the colleges themselves. But the plan did not work in this way. It was, of course, necessary to set up a syllabus in each subject so that a student would have some idea of what was required, but any other control over his preparation was never exercised. Moreover—except in medicine—the certificate of attendance soon became a dead letter. So that soon the University of London developed into a great examining institution, admitting to its tests anyone who wished to take them, and awarding its degrees with no other requirements than a satisfactory response to its examinations. It stood in a relationship to the various colleges in London not noticeably closer than to those in the rest of England, and even

to many in the colonies. For long it was the only English university in which degrees could be obtained without subscription to a particular theological belief. Its influence increased as colleges developed in the provincial centers, and as their graduates were compelled to look to the London examinations for their degrees. So the University, chartered as a method of compromising the difficulties presented by the London colleges, grew to be the great external examining body of the British empire. While it is no longer that, the function of external examination has by no means entirely passed away.

While in theory the system of external examinations may be defended, in practice it is extremely unsatisfactory. It is unfair to the teacher in that it makes his courses subject to an arbitrary standard which he has no voice in setting, and in that it represses the individuality of his teaching and compels him to make the aim of his work the passing of a test rather than of acquiring a control over a subject. It is unfair to the student because the stress of the examining board may be so different from the stress of his teachers as to make the examination no proper test of his acquirements. In other words, when the work of a great central board with wide control, it tends to impose such a degree of uniformity on the whole educational system as to make dangerous those individual deviations which characterize the work of the great teacher and of the intelligent student. The granting of university charters to the provincial institutions has limited the London examinations, more than was formerly the case, to the London colleges. So there rose the demand that the teaching bodies of these colleges should have more to say in the work of the University, and that the latter should take a greater share in the actual teaching of the students. The response to this demand has been considerable, and it has resulted in the complexity of organization which has already been mentioned. It would be profitless to enter into this in detail, but it may be said that University College and Kings College (which long ago lost its theological requirements) have been incorporated into the University, and are managed as parts of that institution; although they retain their individuality as colleges, their teaching staffs, and their entire identity. Internal examinations are now set by boards on which teachers in London constitute a majority, although the assistance of external examiners is always required. The latter are also completely responsible for the external exami-

nations, for which the impossible requirement is made that they be on exactly the same plane as the internal ones. It is to be seen that more than the beginnings have been made in clearing away the difficulties imposed upon the institution by its organization, and in permitting it to make available the real strength which is there. The process still has far to go before the results will be entirely satisfactory.

Of course University College, with its 1600 full time students, and Kings, with over 1000, are not the only branches of London. The Imperial College of Science and Technology at South Kensington numbers over 1000, while the London School of Economics has nearly 500. There are eleven medical schools, including the medical branches of University and Kings. Altogether twenty-one institutions with over 9000 students are ranked as regular parts of the university, but others with slighter degrees of affiliation exist. In fact this question of affiliation, ranging as it does from incorporation into the university to the mere recognition of the sub-division as having "recognized teachers," is the despair of one who studies the situation. In effectiveness, London suffers not only from the diversity of its parts but from their scattered location. Kings College occupies a central position on immensely valuable land in the Strand, but the site is so restricted that expansion is impossible. The others are in all parts of London. Of course, the medical schools must remain with the hospitals, and it would be a misfortune to move the Imperial College from its location in South Kensington, surrounded as it is by the great public museums. But the plan by which the others would be moved to a site in Bloomsbury, with the present location of University College as a nucleus, would give rise to a university quarter in London which would do much to increase the prestige and effectiveness of the institution. Questions of site, however, are always difficult to settle, and apparently many obstacles must be overcome before this dream can be realized.

Curriculum and Teaching Methods

In a limited time it is, of course, impossible to survey London as a whole. Nor for this investigation is such a study necessary. The two great colleges, University and Kings, present in themselves most that can be gained which will be of use to the Ameri-

can college of liberal arts. The inquiry was therefore largely restricted to those institutions. One who comes to them from the older universities is likely to experience a feeling of disappointment. The charm is no longer there. The pleasant externals of university life are largely lacking. There is little attempt to supply residential quarters: the students, in general, live in lodgings or at home. There are athletic fields and numerous athletic organizations, but the question of sport never seems to loom large in the eyes of the undergraduates. The buildings are dignified, but they have the aspect of "public buildings," and lack the home-like atmosphere characteristic of the older universities and of many American colleges. The institution at first sight appears to be a bit dull and dreary. But while the charm may be lacking, the work of the colleges can never be criticized for ineffectiveness. The spirit of earnestness, both in students and in teachers, is impressive. The former seems to have a definite goal which is to be reached with the least possible delay: the purpose of the latter is to get them there by the most efficient process. Leisurely saunterings in the field of knowledge appear to have few attractions to the London student; he wishes to follow the straightest path to the end desired, and it is the duty of the teacher to point out that path. The tendency is specialization in definite professional schools, and a relative neglect of those courses which look towards a broad general training. The numbers in the course in arts are relatively small, the majority of them are women, and even here the goal in sight—except for those who intend to study law—is usually the calling of the teacher in the lower schools. It may safely be said that nearly all the students in London are preparing themselves consciously for some occupation in life to which their work in the university is directly to contribute. Naturally, the atmosphere of these colleges is quite in contrast to that of the older universities.

With a student body of this type, it should not be difficult to maintain high standards. London, from the first, with avowed purpose, has set her minimum requirements on a much higher plane than those of the older universities. Matriculation is a university affair, and depends upon passing examinations which seem much more severe than either responsions or previous examinations. Seven papers must be taken, of which two are in English, two in mathematics, one in Latin or Greek or a science, and two more to be selected from a wide list of optional subjects.

If the student is to take the arts degree, however, the requirements of the curriculum make it necessary for him at entrance to present two languages, one of which must be Latin or Greek.

After matriculation, two roads are open. As is the case with many American institutions, two degrees are given—bachelor of arts and bachelor of science—the former limited to those who have presented Latin or Greek for entrance. The working out of this process results in conditions quite different from those in most colleges at home. The arts degree stands more than with us for a solid core of linguistic work, while the science degree stands for science, and nothing but science. As a result, in general, if a boy enters University or Kings without Latin or Greek, his course through the three years will be practically limited to the natural sciences. It is possible, however, at University College, to take courses which are almost entirely confined to the social sciences. A student who wishes to do this will be likely to attend the London School of Economics, but through an intercollegiate arrangement with this school, a member of University College may take advantage of its courses, while retaining his membership in his own college. In general, the tendency of English students to specialize in the social sciences is not nearly so marked as with us, nor are such departments as political science and sociology so common. The boy is expected to gain his acquaintance with these subjects from his own reading.

For the first year no distinction is made between the course of the pass and honors students. Men who intend to travel these separate roads are for this period treated alike. The arts student must take two languages, one of which must be Latin or Greek, and two other subjects selected from an extensive list. As far as can be made out all his work may be linguistic, if he so wishes. The science student also takes four subjects, one of which must be mathematics or physics. All of them are scientific, except that at University College French or German may be included. At Kings some of the questions on the science examinations are stated in French or German so that the student must have gained a reading knowledge of one of these languages as best he may, but courses in them are not counted in the fulfillment of the requirements for the science degree. At the conclusion of this year, a series of intermediate examinations must be passed.

It is at this point that the student chooses between the pass and honors courses. If he selects the former, and is an arts man, he must continue Latin or Greek and one other language for the remaining two years. He must take two other subjects for the same period, with no restriction as to their nature, except that not more than one can be a natural science. Thus at least one half of all his time in college must be devoted to linguistic work and there seems to be no reason why every particle of it should not be. The possibility of such a training for a broadly educated man is startling. Of course such a selection would rarely or never be made, but it could be. The science student takes three subjects instead of four but they are all scientific. He must go through college with no opportunity whatever of coming in contact, through formal instruction, with anything outside the scientific realm. Surely his "science" degree is warranted.

If the student selects the honors course, his specialization is much like that at Cambridge. His schedule must be approved by the faculty concerned and "must not be conceived in a narrow spirit." In practice this seems to mean that he must take one subject which is not in the field of his specialization, but in one closely related to it. Instruction in the honors work is by definite courses, specially designated in the college calendar as of that grade. The tendency to influence students to the honors rather than to the pass degree is as active here as in the rest of England. The majority of the arts students intend to become teachers. The higher initial pay given by government grant to those who have passed through the requirements of the honors courses in the universities, induces the majority of the embryo teachers to select such work. On the other hand, while the pass degree is not recommended, its requirements are kept on a much higher plane than seems to be the case at the older universities.

The curriculum of the London colleges is strangely unfamiliar to the American teacher. The objections to it, from the viewpoint of the college of liberal arts, seem obvious. But one soon finds that it represents the general English idea of the principle upon which a college should work. Further discussion of its effectiveness may be postponed until the provincial universities are considered.

Instruction in London is by formal courses, and largely by the lecture method. The tutorial system, in its Oxford form, is too expensive to be applied at Kings or University, even if it

were considered desirable. In the former, a large amount of so-called tutorial work is done, but the men are handled in groups of not more than eight rather than singly. Aside from the relative economy of the process, it is felt that the effects are fully as good as the conference with the single individual: that the informal discussions of a group, not too large, are of more value than any man-to-man talks. The idea is not so much the development of personal friendliness, as it is the utilization of the teacher as such to his best advantage. At University College the meetings are in groups of not more than twenty-five, and seem to be much the same as our recitations.

A striking deviation of the method at London from that at the older universities is the care with which the scholastic work of the student is watched, and the pressure which is brought to bear upon him to do as he should. Officers not dissimilar to our deans watch over his progress and endeavor to guide him in the right direction. One gathers, however, that the essentially earnest tone of the London student makes this function less burdensome than it sometimes is with us. Examinations are university affairs, but the committees which set and grade them are selected from the faculties of the affiliated colleges, with the addition of one or more external examiners. This combination almost always works to the advantage of the student. In theory the daily work of the individual is supposed to have nothing to do with the grade of his degree—that depends solely upon his examination—but in practice this daily work is given much weight. The student whose examination is unfortunate, but whose work during the course has been good, is given a higher grade than he has actually earned on the examination through the influence on the board of his teachers who are acquainted with his whole career. On the other hand, the external examiner will not permit the bad reputation which a man may have obtained from indifferent work during his course to interfere with the results of an examination unexpectedly high.

Professorial Appointments

Of particular interest is the method of professorial appoint ments in London; a method which may be regarded as typical of the English system. In general, the number of full professors in the English universities is likely to be smaller than with us, and

their prestige as heads of departments is correspondingly high. When a vacancy occurs in such a position a committee is usually appointed to consider the available candidates. This committee is made up of professors in the institution in question, generally those of closely associated departments, with an equal number of outside experts; specialists in the particular field in which the appointment is to be made. This committee is supposed to survey the whole range of available candidates, and to recommend the one considered the most efficient; with no regard to the place from which he comes.

The object of the system is, of course, to find the best possible man that can be secured. In general, the universities are satisfied with its results, although there is some complaint that not enough attention is given to the peculiar needs of the institution in question, and that the selection is too much based on abstract principles. Such a system works best in a land where the educational institutions are homogeneous, and which is sufficiently limited in extent to make a survey of the whole field possible, and a personal knowledge of the workers in it easy. It has certain obvious weaknesses. Promotions from the lower ranks in a department to professorships in the same institution are not rare, but that course is not the most common one. The man on the spot is always at a disadvantage under such a system. His strength is known, but his weaknesses are also known, and they loom very large when he is under consideration. The man from outside is sure to make his strong points effective; his limitations, unless glaring, are less likely to be a matter of common knowledge. So of two men of equal qualifications, the balances are heavily weighted in favor of the individual from outside. When he has obtained the desired position it is often found that he has defects of his own quite as serious as those of his rival.

Under such a method it is obvious that the ambitious younger member of the staff regards his association with an institution in which he does not hold professorial rank as a temporary connection. As such his primary interest would seem to be, not the advance of his department, but his own advance through transfer to another institution at the earliest possible moment. It is unfortunate for an institution if its younger teachers conceive the idea that they have vested rights to their positions, and that advance will come without special effort: but it is equally unfortunate for the university if they regard their posts as temporary

resting places from which they will flit away as soon as they can. It is of some advantage to a college for its faculty as a whole to feel that they are a part of the institution; for them to know that good work will meet its reward at the place where it is done. Moreover, the kind of reputation which must be acquired by the teacher who would advance by this road is a reputation for work of research. Teaching ability is always mentioned as an indispensable qualification, but everyone knows how little it really counts in the minds of boards such as those described above, in contrast with a reputation for success in investigation. If the man proves that he is competent in the latter respect, it is assumed that he is qualified in the former. So the young man of ambition must devote himself to those things which will count in his advancement. If the university is predominantly an institution for research, that is precisely what should be done. London and the provincial universities pride themselves on being exactly that. But as a matter of fact the great bulk of their work is elementary teaching. It is quite possible that much of it is done by men in subordinate positions, lecturers and readers, who are successful teachers, but who are barred from the higher rewards of their profession from the fact that this success has been obtained at the expense of their reputation as investigators, The perplexing question of balance between teaching and research. a question so troublesome to American colleges, is quite as acute in England. Unfortunately, the method by which appointments are there handled gives little assistance in helping to solve the problem at home.

Chapter XVIII

THE UNIVERSITY OF DURHAM

IT may not be obvious why the University of Durham, one of the smallest in England, should be selected for special comment in this report. But one who has visited that institution on its heights above the Wear, flanked by the old Norman cathedral, and itself housed in the fortress-like palace of the warrior bishops of Durham, can never forget the spectacle which it presents. The charm of Oxford and Cambridge, so woefully lacking in London, is here recovered in its entirety: a charm increased by the unrivalled splendor of its setting. Then, too, it is one of the oldest of the newer universities. In the unrest permeating England in the days of the reform bill, the Bishop of Durham looked apprehensively at the swollen revenues of his diocese in fear lest they should be taken from him and applied to purposes which, as a good churchman, he could regard with nothing but horror. He determined to endow a university, to house it in the palace which had come to him from his predecessors of the middle ages, and to set up thereby an institution which, as the Durham of old had stood as "castle 'gainst the Scot," should present a bold front to the enemies of the established church. As it was conceived in 1832, so, in purpose, it has since remained. Times have changed and the universities with them. Subscriptions to creeds and articles are no longer considered the important matters that they formerly were and the university, except for its theological degrees, no longer insists upon them. Men and women of all beliefs are welcomed within its walls, but it has nevertheless remained a stronghold of the established faith; for years, and still, a leader in the theological training of the clergy of the church of England. Nor is the organic connection with the diocese of Durham weakened. The Bishop is still visitor; he still has apartments in the old castle, now the university; the Dean of the Cathedral and members of its chapter are members of the senate; and the professorships of Greek and divinity are ex-officio canons of the cathedral.

The resources of the college are limited. More than forty per cent of income is derived from the old endowments; a proportion of income from endowments far larger than that of any university in England, save Oxford and Cambridge. Through its tradition, and wisely in view of its limited resources, it confines itself to courses in arts and theology; to subjects which can be taught with relative economy and therefore to the entire exclusion of the natural sciences. In no institution in England is so large a proportion of the students housed within the university walls. The accommodations of the individual colleges take care of practically all, but the function of the college ceases at this point. It does not teach, as at Oxford; it does not have the money; it sinks to a subordinate capacity, though much of its usefulness is still there. To one who walks through the dining hall of the largest of these colleges—the old baronial hall of the castle—comes the picture of the very different scenes upon which the old portraits on the walls must have gazed. And one wonders just how much the impress of Durham on its students depends on the surroundings in which they live.

The branch of the university housed in the episcopal palace is but a portion of the institution as a whole. The most striking impress made upon the visitor is the success of the system of federation which he may here observe. Durham is a city of 17,000 people; it can never hope to furnish the student body of a large institution. As a matter of fact, the number in the Durham branch has always been under three hundred. Fourteen miles away is the busy city of Newcastle with 270,000 inhabitants: ample to supply a thriving institution. There Armstrong College was established in 1871: a college suited to the needs of an urban community; with courses in arts, science and technology; in all respects like the provincial universities later to be described. An independent school of medicine was also set up at Newcastle in 1832. Neither of these institutions could grant degrees and so Armstrong, from the beginning, and the medical school since 1852, have been in that respect dependent on Durham. The friction caused by this arrangement seemed to bid fair to result in the formation of two universities in the north of England: one of moderate strength, the other pitiably weak. But weak degree-granting institutions in England are not regarded favorably by parliament, and it was evidently necessary that some measure of combination should be adopted. The solution came in 1909.

By the provisions of the act of that year, the three institutions were federated into a university with two branches, one at Durham and the other at Newcastle. The university as such has the usual university officers, it sets examinations and it grants degrees. It is financed by small contributions from its branches and from the examination fees. Each subordinate institution has representation on its governing board, and whatever measures of uniformity may be necessary throughout the institution are secured by the discussion and decision of this board. Undue uniformity is precisely what is not desired. A remarkable amount of freedom is left to the subdivisions. They control their own appointments, and their own finances. They set up their own curricula. They are free to develop along lines which seem to them best, subject only to the provision that whatever they do shall be done well enough to satisfy the examination requirements of a board upon which each is represented. So we have such diverse institutions as a college whose purpose it is to serve the needs of a busy industrial community, another which more than any in England holds to the classical tradition with a theological bias, and the third a modern school of medicine, all working in apparent harmony as autonomous parts of a federated union. If units thus diverse can be brought together so that the efficiency and independence of the individual institutions are so little marred by the union with others, there seems to be no limit to the types of college organizations to which the process might be applied.

No lesson is more needed by American institutions than this, and none is less likely to be heeded. The scandalous award of charters by state legislatures to any sort of an alleged educational institution has resulted with us in the mushroom-like growth of colleges far beyond our needs. In the west, in particular, every town which attains a certain sense of self-realization is likely to demand a "college" (if not, indeed, a "university") as a matter of civic pride. Religious denominations, impelled by sectarian pride and by the desire to advance some particular dogma, have in the past tumbled headlong to establish puny colleges in regions where there were already too many. So we have hordes of colleges; of which some are real educational institutions, and some, through weakness or perverted purpose, are quite the contrary. Suggestions of combination are fiercely resented by these organizations as attempts on the part of ambitious rivals

to swallow the rest—as, indeed, they usually are. All of them grant degrees on the basis of standards so various that, unless the college from which it comes is specified, the degree means nothing at all. The example of Durham points the way for an effective remedy for this condition: the principle of federation. No unit loses its identity in the process, no one of them is precluded from following effectively a special purpose, no one loses any individuality which it may have gained, and no one, unless it be interested in maintaining low standards, is injured by the combination. Uniformity of action and of requirements, so far as they may be necessary, are not imposed from above, but are arrived at by mutual agreement. The combination should not be so small as to fail to gain prestige, nor so large (as possibly at London) as to make difficult the free interchange of ideas and the formation of a mutual spirit of compromise and good will on the part of the instructing staffs. Such combined institutions, as their prestige increased and as their effectiveness became evident, might well relieve the overburdened state universities of a portion of the hordes of students which now overwhelm them.

Such a process is not likely to be carried out. Even in England it resulted from causes external to the colleges; the care with which parliament guarded the degree-granting privilege. No such care is to be expected from an American legislature. But if each of the states should remove the privilege of granting degrees from all the institutions within its bounds, and should then reassign it on a principle similar to that which England has adopted, would not our system of education be measureably advanced? That, of course, cannot be done, and would not be if it could; but why should not neighboring colleges, weak in their divided state, but capable of strength when united, put aside their pride of complete independence long enough at least to consider the advantages of the system of federation?

Chapter XIX

THE PROVINCIAL UNIVERSITIES

THE last forty-five years have been notable in England for the work of university building. At the beginning of that period the two older universities, with London and Durham, were the only institutions which had the right of granting degrees. Now the number has been increased by six, all but one of them chartered in the twentieth century. Manchester led the way. Owens College, founded in 1846, petitioned in 1877 for a university charter and received it as Victoria University in 1880. It was provided that the petitioning college should be a constituent member of the organization, and that other colleges in neighboring localities might be admitted. Under this permission University College, at Liverpool, was affiliated in 1884 and Yorkshire College, at Leeds, in 1887. Thus another federated university came into being. There the process rested until 1900. In that year, largely through the influence of Joseph Chamberlain, was chartered the University of Birmingham, having as its nucleus Mason College, founded in 1875. This was the first example in England of a single college university and it soon led the way to others. Liverpool was restive under the control of the Manchester institution, and despite the opposition of Leeds, which was satisfied with federation, broke away from the union and received an independent charter in 1903. The consequent reorganization of Manchester resulted in an independent charter for Leeds in 1904. Thus the federation was broken up and parliament, with equal good sense to that which animated its refusal to permit weak institutions to exist as universities, recognized the claims to independence of the branches of an institution when it was evident that they were strong enough to stand alone. No one can doubt such strength in the three great universities which have grown from Victoria. Next, in 1905, came the charter to Sheffield, which had existed as Firth College since 1879. The latest of the new institutions, this time in the southwest of England, was formed around the University College at Bristol, which dates from 1886, and which was chartered in

1910 as the University of Bristol. The process of university building has paused since that time. Some, at least, of the four still existing university-colleges will in time become degree-granting institutions. Two of them seem to be making progress toward the standard of size and income required for a real university, as can be seen from the table below.

	Students	Income
Exeter	318	£22,929
Nottingham	480	55,022
Reading	573	80,958
Southampton	346	31,977

When such of these institutions as can acquire sufficient strength for real status as universities receive charters, and when, possibly, some provision is made for the region to the south and east of London, the process of the formation of universities should be complete, and the country will have all the institutions of higher education that it needs.

The general character of these institutions is much the same. All are in urban regions; great manufacturing towns, in which—if Bristol be excepted—there is little attractiveness or charm. But they are the industrial centers of England: centers which in these modern days most strongly demand the advantages of higher education, and most eagerly respond to its opportunities when offered. The provincial institutions find their clientele among the children of the lower middle and artisan classes; keen and alert students, but students who, from necessity, have a comparatively limited aim. That aim has its effect on the character of the institution: and although it maintains itself as a real university, with all branches of learning represented, nevertheless it tends to pursue a utilitarian course. Something of this

	Arts	Pure Sci.	Medicine	Technol.	Agric.	Total
Birmingham	537	304	484	311	..	1636
Bristol	348	249	262	162	..	1021
Leeds	432	344	392	343	48	1559
Liverpool	553	417	791	270	..	2031
Manchester	634	527	598	152	..	1911
Sheffield	217	203	156	246	..	822
	2721	2044	2683	1484	48	8980

tendency may be gathered from the preceding table, which shows the distribution of students among the various branches of the universities.

Thirty per cent of the students are in the course in arts. This does not look so unfavorable to liberal culture. But we find that 61% of this number are women; that but a few over 1000 men students in the six universities are in this ostensibly non-vocational course. Many of these are taking arts work preparatory to law or commerce.

The essential similarity of the demands upon these institutions by their clientele makes them much alike. Differences of detail exist, and each is developing an atmosphere of its own, but in going from one to another one gains an impression of their relative uniformity. In this investigation, time was lacking to see them all, and those visited were selected on account of convenience of their location rather than for any other reason. What will be said, therefore, comes from information derived from the Universities of Manchester, Birmingham and Bristol.

Admission to the provincial universities is dependent on passing a definite university matriculation examination, or some equivalent. Five of the six institutions (Bristol being the exception) maintain a joint matriculation board which takes complete charge of both the lower and higher school certificate examinations of the five. The board is made up of teachers in the universities, teachers in the schools, and of members connected with neither. The idea is to get the best men that can be found, with no special preference for individuals connected with the associated universities. The board sets the examinations, grades them, and then, instead of submitting the results to the colleges for their final decision as does our College Entrance Examination Board, decides itself whether or not the candidates have the requirements for admission. In fact, the university has nothing to say in the matter, except that it may prescribe what selection of subjects is to be taken. That prescription made, the actual papers given are the same for all. The board examines annually 17,000 candidates: its results are accepted by other universities as well as the associated ones, and the provincial institutions in turn accept credentials from the other boards which exist in England and Scotland. The whole business of these examining boards is so standardized that no difficulty is experienced in the transfer of credits from one to another. The actual requirements

for admission are practically the same in all the institutions. Five subjects must be taken. One of these is English composition associated with either English literature or English history. Another is either Latin or mathematics. The other three are taken from a list of fifteen, with the requirement that if Latin is the second subject presented, one of the three must be mathematics or a science; if mathematics is offered, one of the three must be a foreign language. The curriculum to be followed in colleges, however, requires the presentation of Latin if the arts degree is the goal. Of course many students proceed beyond the minimum requirement for matriculation, as they do at Oxford, and present credentials from the higher school certificate examination. The treatment of such students, however, is quite different from that pursued in the older universities and will be discussed in a later paragraph.

At this point it may be said that the outlook of the provincial universities upon the work of the school is quite different from that found at Oxford and Cambridge, or even in the London colleges. In general, the men in authority object strongly to what they term the excessive specialization in the lower schools. They resent the existence of a system originating from the conditions at the older universities, which are quite different from those prevalent at their own. The system of specialization adopted at the older schools to meet the scholarship and exhibition examinations of Oxford and Cambridge, a system which has been extended to the newer schools, they believe to work poorly when applied to the product coming to their own doors. They believe that the boy reaches the university too late, and that he has at this relatively advanced age an outlook upon education which he long ago should have exchanged for another. They think he should be ripe for the impress of the university spirit at an earlier age. They believe, moreover, that his specialization in the school has been excessive; that he has not acquired a broad general foundation upon which the university can properly build. They consider that he is urged to determine the direction of this specialization at an age at which it is quite impossible for him to arrive at a wise decision. A professor of chemistry deplored the presence in his laboratory of many students who have no real enthusiasm for science. At the age of sixteen it became clear that they had no taste for Latin. Owing solely to the fact that the school might be in possession of a good chemical laboratory, these

boys were directed that way. Coming to the university with the higher school certificate in science, and having some ambition, the honors course in chemistry was the obvious path. So they go on through their university careers utterly immersed in a subject which grows more distasteful to them the farther they proceed. The Latin being eliminated, there was really nothing else at the disposal of the school that they could do. Nothing is more striking than the unanimity with which the members of the provincial universities denounce the working of this system in the schools beneath them and its effect on their own institutions; and the almost equal unanimity with which the teachers of Oxford and Cambridge—and the school men—favor it.

The reason for this divergence is not difficult to grasp. The provincial universities almost never receive students from the great public schools, nor often from the historic day schools throughout England. Oxford and Cambridge and London take care of such men. The matriculates of the newer institutions come from schools recently established; schools which perforce have adopted the cut and dried methods of their older rivals; methods which from their success in institutions of a special type have come to represent the British idea of what a school should do. So the system, because it fits the needs of the older universities and because it has worked well in the historic public schools, is imposed on the newer universities, and is followed by the newer schools: schools which do well the work of actual instruction, but which have slight measure of that broadening atmosphere and influence so necessary to counteract the obviously narrowing tendency of a course thus planned. Nor can the university itself, in the almost entire absence of residential quarters and of a common life, bring to bear on the situation the factor of education by contact, such as is supplied by the Oxford college. So the provincial teacher complains that in his institution the results of the system are exactly those which his American colleague, from an examination of its requirements, is likely to predict: a prediction which, to his astonishment, he finds far astray if he considers the product of the older universities. The American teacher comes to the conclusion that his criticism of the system as such is justified; that it is only under the peculiar circumstances presented by special types of schools and universities that it works; and that there it works remarkably well. As the atmosphere of Oxford and Cambridge, of Eton and Winchester, in which

it is effective, can hardly be reproduced, there is little in the system itself which is worthy of imitation.

In the provincial universities, as at London, the first year of the course is devoted to preparation for the intermediate examinations. The work in arts consists of five subjects, more or less restricted; of which two must be foreign languages. For the science degree, practically all the work is in scientific subjects. When this examination is out of the way, the student chooses the pass or honors course. The former differs somewhat in the various universities, but in arts a considerable amount of linguistic work is prescribed. Four subjects are usually required and the division of them among groups is intended to secure a certain degree of distribution. In fact, the pass curriculum resembles more nearly the usual course in an American college than does any other arrangement of studies found among British institutions. For the science degree the effect of English practice is evident. Nothing but science is allowed. The honors courses in essence are much the same as those presented in London. Certain deviations from normal practice will be noted later.

The working of this scheme of study is complicated, however, by the variations in the preparation of the entering students. Some come with the equivalent of lower certificate only; others bring the higher school certificate, a preparation which stands for a degree of preliminary training considerably more advanced. At Oxford and Cambridge this variety of preparation, as has been shown, causes no confusion, because the instruction is almost entirely individual and no pretensions are made that all men, upon graduation, are at the same level, and that all degrees of a given designation mean the same. But at the provincial institutions, in which instruction is by formally arranged courses, and in which a degree is meant to stand for something definite, the problem presented by students entering with different degrees of training is a perplexing one. The solution is not the same in all the institutions. Manchester does not recognize the superior proficiency of students with the higher certificate. Such men must take the work in the first year and pass the intermediate examinations in the usual way, although instruction may be given them in special sections. From this point on, everyone proceeds on the same basis. Manchester rather prides herself on this method as being a bit more exacting in its demands than is the process followed by the other universities, and she certainly

shows by it no flattering opinion of the work of the schools. Birmingham and Bristol are more trustful. With them the higher certificate examinations exempt from the requirement of the work of the first year. The student may proceed at once to an honors course if he wishes, or if he takes a pass course he is put with the men whose entrance was on the basis of lower certificate grade and who have a year's work in the university behind them. In two years he completes all the requirements for the degree except one —and that is the three years of residence; an inflexible demand of every English university. The student, if he wishes a degree, must return for another year. During this period he does work of an advanced nature and at the end of it he receives, at Birmingham, the bachelors and the masters degrees simultaneously, at Bristol, the bachelors degree "with credit." The honors course requires, in any case, three years from the time the work is entered upon. As the man who presents the lower school certificate cannot start his honors course until he has been a year in the university, such a course, in reality, requires from him four years for completion. The student bringing the higher certificate can start his honors work at once, and finish his course, therefore, in three years. By the system followed by these universities, therefore, advanced work done in the lower school either diminishes the time required in the university, or if the same time is required, it makes available an additional degree.

In the honors course in science, Birmingham deviates from the system which we have found generally to prevail. Before honors work can be started, the candidate must have passed the examinations for the ordinary degree. In effect, therefore, the course amounts to a year superimposed on the regular pass work. This deviation calls attention to the fact that honors courses in natural science are less distinctive than they are in other subjects. From the nature of the material the path followed must be much the same under any circumstances, and independent study, for a considerable time at least, can hardly be relied upon. More than a suspicion exists that in many universities, while the honors courses in these subjects may cover more material than the pass work, the actual method followed in the two is much the same.

The provincial universities have not succeeded as well as have their older rivals in directing men towards the honors degree. Fifty-two per cent of the degrees awarded by them are to pass candidates. But the same spirit prevails. The pass degree in

arts seems to answer fairly well the American demand for a general course. The honors course in arts and all the courses for the other degrees are highly specialized. These are the paths that most students follow. Even the degree in commerce, offered by some of the institutions, is specialized as much as the nature of the subject admits. It points, at any rate, to a definite end. In general, it is the predominant idea of the English educator that a man who receives the university degree should know at least one subject thoroughly. A professor of chemistry in one of these institutions, in reply to the criticism of narrowness of the work which his men were following, retorted that they become wonderful chemists. Perhaps that is so, but it seems quite as likely that students trained from the age of sixteen in nothing but science would become merely skilled laboratory mechanics. Moreover, in the provincial universities, because of their geographical location and their clientele, specialization is likely to take the form of one-sided technical training; a training which may develop to its extreme from the fact that it is unchecked by the compensating influence of an organized college life. There may be a way to avoid it, but it seems to one who studies the calendars of these institutions, that the student who comes to the university without Latin—unless the institution offers a course in commerce, itself one-sided—must devote his entire time to the natural sciences; and that in a way narrowly utilitarian. It has never been proved that lack of interest in the classics implies devotion to science. Nor is it clear that the great English scientists of the past, of whom the nation may well be proud, were developed by methods like this.

The material which comes to these institutions is wonderfully industrious and ambitious. The problem of prodding the lazy hardly exists. The student body knows what it wants, and is determined to obtain full value for time and money spent. The teacher who gives less than his full quota of lectures is likely to find that his students are protesting to the Vice Chancellor that they are not receiving all that has been advertised. The aim of these men is definite, they pursue it keenly, but, from the nature of the situation, it can hardly fail to be utilitarian. Training, not education, is the end upon which their vision is set. From the student impulse the institution, despite itself, tends to take the tone of a school of technology, though its avowed purpose—which it keeps to as well as circumstances permit—is that of a real university.

A somewhat pessimistic teacher in one of these universities—himself in the natural sciences—maintains that, of the four races in the British Isles, the English care the least for real education; as a people they have never looked upon education as the broadening of the faculties. The higher classes have never had real interest in it: their aim has been limited to a mere veneer which comes from a superficial acquaintance with the classics: and their main demand the opportunity for athletic development. With the extension of educational opportunites to the middle classes, a middle class attitude of mind has come in: namely that of looking at the matter from a practical standpoint, and of asking just how much each subject is to contribute to the earning capacity of the individual. The professor is judged by his success in cramming the boy with enough practical information so that he gets a job. As a result the teacher puts forth his efforts to make his students the best possible specialists, with no attention to the all around development of the man. This is the cause of the system of extreme specialization which has reached its climax in the honors courses, and in all the courses in natural science.

This opinion certainly is extreme, but it is of some help in explaining the impression which the provincial universities make upon the visitor. He may even recall institutions of similar character and inspired by similar motives at home. Such institutions are indispensable in the educational system of the nation, but they can hardly furnish much that is helpful in the solution of the problems which confront the college of liberal arts.

Chapter XX

THE SCOTCH UNIVERSITIES

THE ancient educational foundations of Scotland present a picture quite different from that to be found in the universities of England. The difference is not merely one of method: it is the fundamental one of outlook. No more striking illustration of the fact that Scotland, despite long association with a larger and more wealthy land, has preserved untouched the individuality which is hers, can be found than in the character of her universities. They are rooted in the past of the nation; they were founded in the days when Scotland stood by itself; and they represent a development springing from the racial characteristics of the people and one little influenced by the simultaneous growth of the educational institutions in the land to the south.

The oldest of the four universities is St. Andrews, which was established in the ecclesiastical capital of Scotland in 1411. Located in a city now relatively unimportant, it is the smallest of the old foundations, but perhaps the most attractive. Seated on a height overlooking the wide expanse of sea, housed in buildings which have been its home from early days, in close proximity to the ruins of the palace of the early Scottish archbishops, it has a charm of historic association which places it by itself. The next university, in point of age, is Glasgow, now the largest, established in 1450; newly housed in the outskirts of the second city of Great Britain; an institution markedly influenced by the busy industrial life that surrounds it. Then came Aberdeen in 1494, the most Scotch of all Scotch institutions, in the granite city of the north. Finally—the only post-reformation university—Edinburgh, dating from 1583, with its eighteenth century buildings in the heart of the city, but with many of its departments driven through the necessity of expansion into the suburbs: the most cosmopolitan of the four. All have their interest, but it was found impossible, in this investigation, to reach Aberdeen, and the material here presented is drawn from the other three.

A peculiarity of the Scotch institutions is that from the first they have been closely connected with the state; not in the way of direct control as in our state universities, but through support by public funds. The Scotch were perhaps the first people to recognize the obligation of the nation to provide for higher education at the general expense. As a result, their universities have always enjoyed the support of the public authorities, and have always had on their governing courts representatives of the municipalities in which they are situated. In fact, until 1858—when all the universities received similar autonomous forms of organization—Edinburgh was directly controlled by the council of the city; the body which had founded the university three hundred years before. Moreover, to the Scotch universities as a group is assigned the income of the ten million dollar fund of the Carnegie trust, a body established by the American steel magnate to aid in the educational development of his native land. The administration of this fund has not met with unanimous approval, but its success in increasing the attendance of the universities, through scholarship grants, has been marked.

The nature of the Scotch university is largely determined by the character of its student body. Scotland has always been a land small in population and poor in resources. But nowhere have the benefits of education been more highly valued or more eagerly sought. In the four universities are 11,170 students, a ratio of one student to every 438 of the total population. In all England there are but 31,079; or one to 1,112. The urge for education has always been a prevailing tendency in the northern land. Moreover, this student body is possessed by an earnestness which is almost formidable in its character. It is estimated that at least ninety per cent of its undergraduates are able to attend the university only at the expense of severe personal sacrifice on their part and on the part of their parents. The man of wealth, to whom hard work does not appeal, goes to Oxford or Cambridge; institutions the scholastic tone of which is regarded both by the Scotch and by the provincial universities with something not far removed from contempt. This earnest group of students is not so much animated by the desire for quick returns and utilitarian instruction as is the Englishman of the lower middle class in the provincial centers. The importance of a thorough general training is better understood, and is reflected by the student distribution: as appears from the following table.

Full time Students at Scotch Universities

	Arts	Pure Sci.	Med.	Tech.	Agric.	Total
Aberdeen	761	162	533		94	1550
Edinburgh	1589	305	1539	227	190	3850
Glasgow	1741	410	1579	575	44	4348
St. Andrews	257	164	284	45		750
	4348	1041	3934	847	328	10498

Forty-one per cent of the students are enrolled in the course in arts; and of these arts students more than half are men. The Scotch youth, whatever his destination, is inspired by the fixed purpose to get all that he possibly can from the facilities which are offered him. He listens to lectures with painful intensity, and his notes are copious and thorough. He spends what even his instructors regard as an unreasonable amount of time in the library. He can be relied upon to do faithfully any task which is submitted to him, and to do it with a thoroughness which is hardly met with elsewhere. He is a keen critic of his teachers, and slipshod lecturing, poor preparation, or any deviation from the established order, bring at once student rebuke, expressed in a way which is quite unmistakable. Organized athletics play no part in the university life. At Edinburgh university teams are of little consequence and the athlete is likely to play for outside organizations. He is regarded by the student body as, on the whole, one who is wasting valuable moments for things essentially trivial, and his prestige is the opposite of high. At St. Andrews the endeavor was made by the faculty to develop formal sports, but the hard-headed Scotch student looked the situation over, and decided that time spent for such purposes was lost at a period when the opportunities for intellectual advancements were such as never would be offered again. So he has refused to interest himself in the matter. The picture of a faculty trying vainly to impose sport upon an unwilling student body is not without its humorous appeal to the observer from an American college. Of course, the Scotch student is not at all times the dour and over-earnest individual that this description might lead one to think. Much amusement was caused by the humorous chagrin of a dean at Edinburgh who, after picturing to the visitor the student in these sombre colors, carried his guest to the college

dining hall and found there, caparisoned as pirates and bandits, a horde of students who had engineered a burlesque kidnapping of the Chief Secretary for Scotland, and were holding him in confinement—at luncheon—until he should be ransomed by the citizens of the municipality; the spoil to be applied to the benefit of the hospitals. The Scots of this episode were not dour, but they were canny, for the ransom was raised and the hospitals profited much thereby. Such frivolity is not common, and in general the Scotch student is at most times a serious individual with an eye to the main chance—in this case an education which shall cover ground as extensive as time will permit. It is difficult for the American teacher to refrain from open envy of his Scotch colleague when he surveys the advantages presented to the latter by the material with which he deals.

In general, the discussion of university organization has been omitted from this report, as being outside its scope. One feature of the government of the Scotch universities, however, seems worthy of mention; unique as it is in giving to the undergraduates a voice in the formation of the general policy of the institution: and in its administration. So far as could be learned this arrangement is nowhere else to be found. The Lord Rector is a peculiar official. He is elected for a three year term by the undergraduates. The elections are usually lively affairs, and the issue is likely to turn on contending political interests of the day. Politicians, therefore, are the most frequent occupants of the rectorial chairs; but the field is not limited to them, as is shown by the historic example of Carlyle as Rector of Edinburgh. At the present time Lord Birkenhead is Rector of Glasgow, Mr. Rudyard Kipling of St. Andrews, and Mr. Sidney Baldwin of Edinburgh. The incumbent of the office is expected to deliver a rectorial address during his term, and it frequently happens, if the rector is a politician, that by the time the address is ready, the wave of popularity which carried him into office has receded, leaving him high and dry. If this has been the course of events, the occasion of the rectorial address is not one of much joy to the speaker, for the Scotch student is not slow in manifesting his disapproval of the individual whose hold upon him has relaxed, nor is he delicate in his methods of administering rebuke. The recent experience of Mr. Lloyd George, the predecessor of Mr. Baldwin at Edinburgh, is a case in point. The Rectorship is by no means an honorary office; the duties of the incumbent do not

cease with the delivery of the address; the position is one of real importance. The rector is ex-officio a member and chairman of the university court, a body which has the responsibility and the power of an American Board of Trustees. Probably he seldom devotes himself conscientiously to these allotted functions, but, in addition, he has the appointment of another member of this board; in which appointment he may, if he wishes, consult the opinion of the undergraduates to whom he owes his office. The student has real representation on the governing board of the institution, a condition which is found, so far as can be gathered, nowhere but in Scotland.

Admission to the Scottish universities is upon a basis uniform for all. Both the entrance requirements and the examinations set are the same for each of the four. The machinery of the system is administered by a common board in the membership of which each institution is assigned equal representation. Candidates for admission must pass the "preliminary examination" given by this board, or must submit credentials which are considered equivalent to it. The specified subjects are four: English; Greek or Latin: Mathematics; a second language or dynamics. In the second and third of these subjects, examinations are given of different standards, and in one of the two that of the highest standard must be passed. The candidate for the science degree must meet the test of the highest standard in mathematics (unless he chooses to present an additional language as a fifth subject) and may, if he wishes, substitute French or German of higher standard for Latin or Greek of a lower standard. Of course, if the subjects are rightly selected, credentials from other boards in the British Empire are accepted as substitutes, and so are certain "leaving certificates" given by the Board of Education to the pupils of Scotch schools.

This is the machinery of the system. The spirit of it is more important and, when investigated, is found to be one surprisingly different from that which prevails in England. It is true that in both countries the process which keeps the student in the lower schools has been equally effective. This fact is illustrated by the present position of the preliminary examinations. Formerly these tests were taken after one or more years in the university. Now they have been shoved back to the position of entrance tests, and, incidentally, a curious development has resulted; that of awarding the degree of master of arts rather than that of bachelor

of arts directly upon graduation from the university; a peculiar practice that is general throughout Scotland. Although more time is now spent in the lower schools, it is not employed in the same way as in England. All Scotland seems to be unanimous in the belief that the degree of specialization which prevails in the later years of the English school is thoroughly unfortunate: that it results in a product upon the training of which it is impossible for the university properly to build; and that it is a product hampered through life by a false scale of values set up at an early age. All Scotland is determined that nothing of the kind shall prevail at home. So while the school retains possession of the boy at an age when formerly he was in the university, it by no means allows him to concentrate intensively upon a narrow range of subjects. His "general" education continues until he enters the university—and does not stop even there. Nor do the special scholarship and exhibition examinations tend to divert the candidate, as they do in England, into advanced work along narrow lines. The "bursaries," which correspond to them, exist, but the test is not one which requires in preparation extensive specialization, but rather is based on special excellence in a field which all must traverse. Thus the Scotch theory of secondary education is utterly diverse from that of England, and is not different in principle from that which prevails in America.

Not less surprising, to one who comes to Scotland from the English universities, is the nature of work required, particularly in the course in arts. Let us first consider the curriculum of Edinburgh. It is relatively simple. Five subjects are required, two of which must be continued through two years. The one definite prescription is that philosophy or moral philosophy must be included in the course. Four "departments of study" are set up: the first embraces the languages, the second, mental philosophy (economics is placed in this group), the third, science and mathematics, and the fourth, history and law. The only other definite prescription is that the student's course must embrace subjects taken from at least three of these four departments of study. The novel features of such a curriculum are not few. The first is the requirement of philosophy; a requirement not confined to Edinburgh, but prevailing throughout the Scottish institutions. It has a historical justification. From earliest times the arts degree in Scotland has centered around philosophical rather

than about linguistic studies. The scholarly repute of her universities has, perhaps, been more potent in the field of philosophy than in any other. So there is much to warrant the present day emphasis upon this subject. But we cannot conceal our amazement when we find that it is possible to obtain the arts degree at Edinburgh not only without Latin in the university, but without any linguistic work there at all. To one brought up n the older American tradition of what an arts degree should imean, this seems an impossible condition, and he waits expectantly for the university to fall in ruins under the just wrath of those who so valiantly defend the essentially linguistic training necessary for him who expects to be a master of arts. It should be said, however, that this deviation from the path of righteousness occurs in none of the other universities in Scotland. If this one heresy be overlooked, the design of the course seems eminently sensible. A wide distribution is provided; one even wider than it seems to be, for the subjects to be taken through two years are so managed that different but closely related departments are frequently embraced in the single course. At the same time it makes concentrated effort possible, inasmuch as during two of the three years but two subjects are carried at one time, and in the other year but three.

At Glasgow the general arrangement is the same. Logic or moral philosophy is required of all and, while there is no special requirement of Latin, one course at least must be linguistic. The most novel feature of this curriculum is the recognition of the obvious but neglected principle that all men cannot be treated alike. Instead of arranging one Procrustean curriculum for all, four different combinations are set up; one for the man who is heading in no special direction, and the other three for men whose tastes are for the sciences, languages, and social sciences respectively. A generous requirement is made for studies outside the special interests of the individual (as much as two-sevenths of the whole), but an equal amount is devoted to the subject which attracts him most. The remainder of the course is entirely free. It may be said, however, that all the choices possible at Glasgow may be made under the freer arrangement at Edinburgh—and many more besides. St. Andrews is more conventional. Here Latin or Greek must be taken, together with one other language. There is a choice between philosophy and mathematics, and one science is required.

The feature in common to all these curricula, and one which is most sharply in contrast with American practice, is the limited number of courses carried at one time. At most it will not amount to more than three: for the greater part of the time it is limited to two. In general Scotch teachers strongly defend this system, although at times, but very rarely, doubt was expressed that the student was given enough to do. It was commonly felt, however, that time should be given to the boy so that he may really get somewhere with the material upon which he is engaged; that he should not be too much diverted by a variety of interests; that concentration, within limits, is more effective than diffusion. It was the general opinion that the time given to the Scotch student by this method was well spent. Moreover, the idea was often expressed that opportunity should be given in student days for independent reading and browsing in the fields of knowledge; that it is particularly important for this liberty to constitute a part of university life because there will be little chance for such a process in the years to follow. Here again it was the opinion that the Scotch student actually uses his leisure for this purpose, and profits much thereby. Particularly interesting was the comment of a Scotch teacher who had spent ten years as professor in an American university. His strongest objection to the American method was directed against what he termed the crowding of the student with many subjects so that none of them could be done as they ought to be. The conscientious student, he said, is so busied with meeting the demands of his various courses in subjects widely diverse, that he has no time really to think over and absorb that which he takes in. As a result he never obtains that real mastery over a field of knowledge which should be the purpose of education. The picture of the American student as a harried individual, overdriven by his teachers, has its elements of novelty: but if that student were really seriously at work to gain from his education those things which education should give, if the college meant to him the opportunity for absorption into his being and of molding into form, by his own mental processes, the materials presented, instead of meaning lessons to be learned as the schoolboy learns them, perhaps the criticism of the Scotch professor would be much to the point.

The course for the science degree conforms more nearly to the English model; the work therein is almost entirely limited to scientific branches. The distribution among the various sciences

must, however, be rather more extensive than in the English universities. Edinburgh requires four years for the ordinary science degree, while it may be obtained at Glasgow and St. Andrews in three. The science course seems to deviate from the theory which is at the basis of the Scotch system. Here, as in England, if a man comes to the university without Latin, he must devote himself throughout his course to work of the most specialized character. The only relief from this condition seems to be in the courses in commerce (not offered at Glasgow). Even these courses are made as technical as the nature of the subject will permit. Some of the Scottish teachers, many of them scientists, recognize the fact that the specialization in science is extreme. At one university, indeed a definite recommendation was submitted to the faculty to the effect that certain arts courses should be opened to the science students and that they should be allowed to make them a part of the work for the degree. Curiously enough this proposition was strongly supported by the science teachers, but was defeated by the votes of the members of the faculty of arts. No one could give a convincing reason for this opposition.

Honors courses exist in these universities, but their effect is quite different from that of similarly named courses in England. The rule in Edinburgh and Glasgow is that the honors student must take four of his seven courses in subjects included in honors group, and two of these must be definite specialized honors courses. At the conclusion of this work, a special examination must be passed. At St. Andrews, although there is no definite calendar regulation to that effect, the honors course seems to be a year's specialized work superimposed on the regular course. The honors courses in natural science in all the institutions are, likewise, of this character. Four years, therefore, are definitely required at St. Andrews for the honors degree, and are also required at Edinburgh and Glasgow for such a degree in the course in science. As a matter of fact in other honors subjects, either by definite departmental fiat or by the nature of the work, four years are practically always needed to fulfill the established requirements: and the student usually reckons on that period as necessary to his work. A decided novelty, and one that seems worthy of imitation, is the requirement of the French and German departments at Edinburgh that all honors students shall spend one of their four years in a French or German university. Such

men are matriculated students at Edinburgh at the same time, and must, at the end of each term, send home a report of their progress. The work thus done counts towards the Edinburgh degree.

In essence the honors courses at these institutions are advanced courses superimposed upon, or only partially replacing those required for the regular degree. In only two courses of the seven are the honors students treated by themselves. Thus the difference in quality between the two degrees is far less marked than it is in England. It is not to be assumed, however, that this difference is due to lower standards set for the honors course; it comes, rather, from the higher requirements of the pass degree. In the majority of courses students who are taking the pass work and those taking the honors work are treated together, and the general tendency is to raise the character of such courses to the honors standard. As a result, the pass degree has a prestige which it never enjoys in England. No one thinks of the pass man as indifferent, or as an individual who is looking for an easy college life: his intellectual qualities, as a pass man, are never, thereby, held in contempt. The requirements of the degree are such as to make impossible judgments of this kind. The pass degree in itself represents a thoroughly creditable achievement, but if the student wishes to continue farther, if he can devote an extra year to his educational development, or if he wishes to work more intensively in a given field, the honors courses are open to him. Even these are so guarded by other requirements that it is impossible in them to live continuously in a specialized atmosphere, as must be done by the honors student in England. With the elevation of the pass course to such a level that a person with an intellectual bent can look upon it with respect, the proportion of students enrolled under it increases; so that 70% of the graduates of the Scotch universities obtain the pass degree.

Instruction in these institutions is, and always has been, by the lecture method. It works, because the student is keenly interested in the subject matter of the lectures, and he so devotes himself to the mastering of whatever is offered that the method of presentation is of little importance. The Scottish lecturer by no means makes his object the "covering of the course." The painfully meticulous "planning" of subject matter which is often worked out with such care with us;—schemes by which the work to be done each day is, in advance, carefully assigned to that day;

schemes by which even a given exercise is laboriously divided into topics and a definite time given to each;—such plans form no part of the Scottish course. The lecturer seldom tries to outline the material completely: the student is expected to look after that himself. Questions may occur on the examinations which have never been discussed in the lectures, and no one objects. The lecturer discusses those points which he considers particularly salient: he tries to synthesize and place in proper perspective the material which the student himself has acquired. Or it may be that the teacher simply devotes his attention to the topics in which his own interests lie. There is no student protest at this method, if the lectures are such as to command intellectual respect. In general, the courses are planned with the idea in mind that the student possesses an intellectual curiosity which will urge him efficiently to do for himself the work which should be done: the teacher is merely a help to him in that process.

Examinations differ from those in England and more resemble our own. They are given at the end of each course and are final for that course. At St. Andrews, only, is there provision at the end of the period of university residence for a more searching and comprehensive examination in the "principal subject." For the honors degrees such examinations, of course, are a necessity in all cases.

Tutorial work after the Oxford model is not a feature of the Scotch system. Lectures are supplemented by what is called "tutorial instruction," the nature of which varies in different departments. It may resemble our recitations; it may take the form of group conferences and discussion; it may simply consist of additional informal lectures. The universities have not at their disposal the funds for true tutorial work, and opinions of their teachers are divided as to the advisability of such a system, should it be possible to put it into effect.

It would be difficult under any system of instruction so to treat students of the character of those who attend the Scottish universities that they would fail to profit by their course. The problem which presses so heavily upon American institutions, what shall be done with the lazy or indifferent member of the college community, has no counterpart in Scotland. Even if it be granted that their task is relatively easy, nevertheless, the educational theories at the basis of their system seem admirably sound, and the application of them seems characterized by a

degree of consistency not always reached in university administration. Most of all, their policies are the result of a process by which the problem is properly visualized, and clear common sense is applied to its solution. Their methods are eminently sensible, but in them the guiding ideals are never lost to view. As those ideals are much the same as our own, the methods by which they work must always constitute a fascinating study to the American observer, and must furnish him with suggestions of no small value in their application to the conditions under which he works.

Chapter XXI

CANADIAN UNIVERSITIES

An interesting adaptation of the English method to an American environment is found in the Canadian universities. The University of Toronto is, more or less, a federated institution. It is made up of the provincial university and three previously existing denominational colleges. The latter gave up their independence as a result of their desire for state aid, which they could receive only on the condition of combination. They still retain control over their endowments, they furnish instruction in religious courses and other branches which are the least expensive, and they supply living accommodations to their students. Laboratory and library facilities are looked after by the university. A student of each of the four institutions may attend courses in any other, and the teacher seldom knows to what college the individual students under his charge belong. There are also other affiliated institutions, students of which are allowed to attend certain university courses.

The pass and honors students are separated by matriculation tests. The former enter by the junior matriculation examination, involving Latin, a second foreign language, English, mathematics and a science. The work of freshman year is practically all prescribed and is, in general, a continuation of the subjects presented for entrance. At the end of this period the student selects five subjects, one of which must be a foreign language, for his future work. Courses in these five subjects must be carried through the remaining three years of his course.

The honors student must submit different credentials. In addition to the junior matriculation examination, he must pass a special honors entrance examination, preparation for which involves one or two years of additional work in the secondary school. The selection of honors courses is not denied to men who obtain low grades in these examinations (provided the tests are passed); it depends merely on the amount of material which has been covered and not on its quality. In the university such a student takes honors courses directed by the department in

question, and so distributed as to meet the needs of those specializing that particular field. Occasional pass courses may be included in this honors curriculum, but not many. The examinations are given at the end of each year and there is little attempt to provide tests of the comprehensive type. It is, however, possible for a department to omit the third year examinations and to sum up the work of the last two years at the end of the course. If a student wishes to take honors in a department not represented in the curriculum of the secondary school, it is apparently necessary for him to enter on junior matriculation, to transfer to the honors course at the end of his first year, and in all, to spend five years in the university. About 55% of the student body are enrolled in the honors course.

The condition at McGill is somewhat different. Junior matriculation admits to the university, and in his first year the student takes *six* courses, more or less closely prescribed. If, however, the senior matriculation examination is passed, the work of this year is not required; the student enters directly on what may be considered second year work in the university, and normally requires but three years for the attainment of the degree. Either type of student may at this point elect the pass or honors course; and his acceptance for the latter (in arts) does not seem much to depend on the excellence of his work. The question is whether or not he wishes to specialize, and he is only prevented from doing so by previous work decidedly bad. In the pass work he takes three "continuation subjects," each to be continued three years. Two of these must be languages, and one from a group embracing the social sciences, mathematics and philosophy; or two from the latter and one from the former. In addition, he must take two additional courses in his second year and one in each of the following years. Two of these must be from the science group. The requirements for the honors courses are much like those of Toronto. The science courses in both the universities have requirements that are essentially similar to those in arts. The amount of science required is considerably more than that demanded in some American institutions, but there is opportunity—as there never is in England—for the election of a reasonable number of subjects outside the scientific realm.

It will be seen that the Canadian system is a combination of the features which prevail in England with those which are

common at home. Thoroughly English is the division of the curriculum into pass and honors courses, with the consequent encouragement of specialization; and the tendency to push back into the school work formerly done by the university. More like the American practice is the relatively small reliance on examinations; the organization of instruction; the encouragement, even in the honors courses, of a considerable degree of distribution; and the relatively large number of subjects studied at the same time. It is doubtful, however, if American practice will tend to change in such a direction as to adopt those features of the English system which seem to appeal to Canadian educators.

Chapter XXII

SUMMARY

WHAT are the conclusions which may be drawn from this inspection of the British educational systems: conclusions which will be helpful to the American college? In the preceding chapters various interesting points of view and various suggestive methods have been discussed. It is obvious that many features of the British system can only be considered in the light of examples to avoid. It is not necessary to recapitulate them here. But it is well to summarize briefly at this point those features which seem well worth the attention of the American educator. It is not true, of course, that all these points are to be found in any one university; they are derived, rather, from a consideration of the desirable features of all the institutions visited. Nor is it to be assumed that such features are entirely absent from all American colleges, or from all the branches of any one of them. The comparison is a general one and breaks down in individual cases.

I. The English educator is always on the lookout for the exceptional student, and he is determined that any system devised shall be such as to give to that student the maximum advantage. The university system is built with the training of the "clever" boy as its central feature. Not only is his prestige respected but he is so handled that those idiosyncracies, which often accompany talent, are not allowed to stand in the way of his full development. *The most striking superiority of the English system over our own is the care which is taken to develop the brilliant student to his full capacity.*

II. The conception formed by the English educator of the attitude of the student toward his educational opportunities is in striking contrast to our own. The assumption is made that facts will be mastered and fields of knowledge covered with little external assistance. The helpfulness of the teacher is centered on the assistance which he gives to the student in his attempts to synthesize this material. *A superiority of the English system, almost equal to the one above, is that the student is assumed to be*

acquiring an education mainly by his own efforts, but with the assistance of the teacher, rather than learning lessons in the fashion of the schoolboy.

III. As a result of this point of view, formal instruction is not necessarily, or even often planned to cover meticulously all the material which the subject requires. It is assumed that the student knows how to read, and will read. And so the system has the advantage that *formal instruction is designed to correlate material at the disposal of the student from other sources, and not to supply that material first hand.*

IV. Specialization in England seems to the outside observer to be excessive. No one would wish to imitate the system as a whole. But that a certain degree of specialized knowledge is desirable is recognized by most of our colleges in schemes of majors: schemes which are not particularly effective. England on the whole, succeeds better than we do *in requiring the graduate to acquire a real mastery over some one field of knowledge.*

V. The system of honors courses is not without defects. But by them, more than with us, *the opportunity is afforded to the student who has some special interest to carry his work in that field to a point limited only by his own industry and capacity.*

VI. At the same time in the British university the course as a whole cannot be made up of things entered upon and soon abandoned. Nor are the individual courses so planned that the work is cut up into petty requirements. In other words *the English student is not allowed to make his education a patch work of snippets and half measures; the survey of a variety of subjects with no control over any.*

VII. The number of subjects treated at one time is smaller than with us, but the attention which an earnest student devotes to them is probably much greater. So under the English system *the attention of the student at a given period is concentrated on a limited field and a scattered diffuseness is avoided.*

VIII. The tutorial system of Oxford and Cambridge has its weaknesses. But there is no question that at its best *the direct individual attention given to students of high capacity by competent teachers is much to the advantage of the former.*

IX. The system of examination boards which contain members from outside the university is not, perhaps, worthy of imitation. But there is no question that it results, on the part of the teaching staff, in *greater care and thought in the preparation of examinations than is usually the case with us.*

X. Course examinations are not unknown in England and there seems to be an increasing tendency toward their use. But so long as the system of honors courses prevails, *the greater number of students are subject at the end of their course to a general comprehensive examination, which tests mastery of a whole subject rather than knowledge of the details of a limited field.*

XI. The care with which the right of granting degrees has been guarded, by the public authorities, has resulted in the absence of weak independent institutions, and has given to the work the *example of colleges joined into federated universities, a system which combines the strength, resulting from union, with the flexibility coming from a large degree of independence of the individual parts.*

PART III

Chapter XXIII

THE CURRICULUM

HAVING thus considered in some detail the British system of higher education, and having derived from it suggestions which may be helpful in solving the problem presented to American institutions, let us return to our original quest. If the thesis developed in Part I of this report is correct, we must regard the primary purpose of the college as intellectual,—but we must have in mind that the attainment of that purpose is hindered by certain conditions to which the American boy is subject, and which are beyond the power of the college to change. Under these circumstances, the institution fails to develop in the youths under its charge the degree of intellectual interest which it should. Little chance of improvement is offered by the relatively easy process of repression: by forbidding or limiting those external activities in which the interests of the normal boy naturally lie. Limitations, of course, must be imposed, if the academic machine is to work at all, but they have little effect in modifying the conditions which are at the root of the matter. If progress is really to be made, it can be brought about only by the very difficult process of raising the whole tone of things intellectual among the undergraduate body to such a plane that matters less important sink to their proper level. Not in a spirit of over optimism, but on the other hand with no resigned attitude of utter hopelessness, let us consider in the remainder of this report the possibility of making the intellectual appeal of the college more effective.

In the investigation upon which this work was based, information was obtained by personal visits to some twenty American institutions of varying kinds. Limitations of time made impossible as wide a survey as might be wished, but the institutions were so selected as to give examples of all types, from the overgrown university to the small college; from the institutions of extreme conservatism to those most prone to educational experimentation; and the data gathered should be representative of the outlook on education of American colleges and universities as a

whole. It has seemed best to treat the material in a different way from that followed in the discussion of the English system, and so the various chapters will be devoted to topics rather than to individual institutions.

The colonial colleges had no difficulties with their curriculum. The course of study was traditional and much alike in them all. At its center were Latin, Greek and mathematics, while in the latter years of the course much stress was placed on moral philosophy, natural theology and the like. Other subjects, particularly rhetoric, were included, but their position was relatively a secondary one. Generally the entire course was prescribed and no one seemed to think of objecting to its rigidity. Such a curriculum had the advantage of continuous and consecutive work in a few subjects, so much so that it would probably be considered as over-specialized by the educator of today. The principles and subject matter of it, much modified it is true, are still cherished by some as models desirable to follow. Such individuals point to the nature of the college product of these early days and ascribe its excellence to the subject matter of the course. One wonders if that product really was so much better than that of today. We are likely to have in view the shining examples of excellence of past times while the ordinary rank and file are quite forgotten. But even if we admit that in the graduate of 1800 the purpose of the college was better fulfilled than it is in him of 1920, we will have difficulty in assigning relative weight to the factors which may have led to that result. It is hardly fair to attribute all this alleged superiority to the nature of the studies which the student of early times pursued, and to neglect the kind of boy he was, his home environment, his earnest purpose, and the fact that much of his work was continuous and cumulative in a single field.

In the last half of the nineteenth century the situation was entirely changed. The reasons for the new development are obvious. The first was the incursion of new subjects—beginning with modern languages, then the natural sciences and finally the social sciences—which were knocking at the academic doors with such force and persistency that their way could no longer be barred. Secondly, there came the theory, advanced by educators of high prestige, that the true purpose of education could best be served by allowing the student to select the subjects which he wished to study. Under the influence of these two factors the

old system crumbled and was replaced, for a time, by a condition not far from chaos so far as it related to any common purpose among the colleges. As time went on and the weaknesses of extreme positions were recognized, modifications in both directions were so made that today the general idea which governs all college curricula, diverse as their details may be, is much the same.

While the uniformity of this principle is striking, it has come to be through the compromise of two diverse theories. It is not that different sets of men holding opposite principles arrive, under the necessities of the case, at a workable method. That sometimes happens, but more often the individual faculty member so harmonizes the two principles in his own mind as to lead to a compromise by which he is convinced that the advantages of both are gained. Nevertheless, the principles *are* opposed, and the result *is* a compromise.

One view of the function of the college faculty is that it should act as a guide. The field of knowledge is wide, its divisions are of varying significance. No immature boy can expect to form a correct judgment of what is important for him to learn, and what is not. The faculty has traversed that field: it commands a general oversight of it; in its mature wisdom it can see the bearings and relationships of branches of learning, and can select those which are fundamental to the training of the intelligent man. Therefore, let the faculty prescribe the work that shall be done, and let the student, conscious of the superior wisdom of those who select, follow their lead without question. In the words of Dr. Meiklejohn, one of the mistakes of the teacher is "that all knowledge is so good that all parts of it are equally good. This represents the scholar of the day at his worst, both as a thinker and a teacher. In so far as it dominates a group of college teachers, it renders them unfit to determine a college curriculum." So while the elective system is not to be abandoned entirely, "if the special interest of the student comes into conflict with more fundamental ones, then we of the college cannot leave the choice to him."

The other view is the direct opposite. In the opinion of those who hold it, men are not alike; they come to college with different capacities, with different interests, with different purposes. To treat them in uniform fashion, to assume that there are certain fundamental subjects in college of which all men equally must partake, is both stupid and ineffective. No faculty, however

wise, can pick out so good a course for the student, however unwise he may be, as that individual can select for himself. As the matter is stated by President Jordan, if the old question of Spencer, "What knowledge is worth most?" is put to the student, the only reasonable answer is, "That which is worth most to me." And President Eliot in reply to complaints that the elective system in practice is ineffective, said that he had never known a student of any capacity to select for himself a set of studies covering four years which did not apparently possess more theoretical and practical merit for his case than did the required curriculum of Harvard of his own undergraduate days.

These, then, are the two contending principles, neither of which in its full application has been found to be entirely satisfactory. As a result, in practically all institutions, the compromise spoken of above has been reached; a compromise which in general embodies the following points:

I. A portion of the work is confined to courses absolutely required, or restricted to narrow options. This part of the course represents knowledge "which no educated man should be without."

II. A provision for concentration, which embodies consecutive work in some one field.

III. A provision for distribution, either through definite prescriptions, as under I, or by a system of minors or other restriction of elections.

Such a scheme does not seem a bad one in theory. Let us see how it works. Our first step would seem to be a comparison of requirements in representative institutions.

The statistics in the following tables are presented with some diffidence. It is not always easy to interpret the requirements as stated in college catalogues, and, moreover, the division between the various categories mentioned is in many cases a matter of personal judgment, and one difficult to make. Absolute accuracy is not vouched for, but the reliability of the results is sufficient to warrant whatever deductions may be drawn from them. The figures are given in semester hours, based on a total requirement of about one hundred twenty for the degree. If this total requirement is a different number, it has been necessary to apply a factor to bring the statistics for that institution into conformity with the others. Latin in college has to do with the prescription in college of courses in Latin (or Greek). The column headed

"required" summarizes hours required in a single department; "narrow option" those in which the choice is between not more than two subjects (usually it is much less than this—as two out of three, etc.). The figures in these two columns should be added together if an estimate is to be formed of the amount of rather rigid requirements. By "wide option" is meant a choice of one subject out of at least three. In both these cases of options the freedom of choice is often less than it seems to be. Frequently it is regulated by secondary school courses (as Latin or Greek for the A.B. degree) or other prerequisites. Linguistic work includes requirements in English. No account is made of the time devoted to physical education. In cases in which the number of hours prescribed depends on preparatory school work, it is usually true that the lower figure is sufficient, if the credits presented in those subjects equal the ordinary college requirement for admission. In the second table the "degree" is the one given for general college work done by a man not presenting Latin or Greek, and does not apply to a specialized scientific training.

It will be seen from these tables that variations of the widest extent are to be found in the curricula, although the general principles governing them all is much the same. It is true that Harvard in her recession from the principle of unhampered electives has not gone very far. The principle of concentration has been adopted, and there is some attempt to enforce distribution but not one which is applied to definite courses. At the other extreme is Dartmouth, with at least half the work of the student restricted within fairly narrow limits, and with the attempt to apply the principle of scattering of interests in such a way not only as to secure a broad distribution, but one for which fairly definite courses must be chosen. It requires for the arts degree as much linguistic work as any institution and more science than any other, and for either degree nearly double the amount of social science. On the other hand, the major requirements are relatively small, and, as a matter of fact, are even less than they seem. The status of the "complementary course," which makes a part of this major, has so developed as to make it practically a free elective; and the major is thus reduced to one of 18 hours. Truly the principle of distribution has been carefully guarded, whatever may be said of that of concentration.

Table I. A. B. Degree

	Latin in col.	Absol. req.	Narrow opt.	Wide opt.	Majors	Minors	Linguistic	Nat. Science	Soc. Science	Philosophy, art, music, etc.
Amherst	yes	12	6	24	36	—	18	18	6	0
Brown	yes	21	24	9	24	—	21-27[1]	6-18[12]	12	9
Columbia	no	21	6-12[2]	0-6[2]	36	—	12-18[2]	0-11[2]	10	0
Cornell	no	12	12	18	20	—	12	12	12	6
Carleton	no	6	12	6	33+	28	18	14	14[13]	
Dartmouth	yes	12	48	6	24	—	24	15	21	6
Harvard[5]	no[3]	8	0	0	48	—	16[4]	8-16[8]	8	0-8[8]
Haverford	yes	27	18	12	18	24	24	12	6	9
Knox	yes	30	6-24[2]	6	20	—	12-30[2]	12	9	9
Minnesota[6]	no	10	0-13[2]	14	18-24	6	10-23[2]	7	7	0
Oberlin	no[3]	16	6	22	18-36	—	12-18[7]	8-14[7]	6	12
Princeton	yes	12	12	0	32	—	12	6	0	6
Swarthmore	no	10	6	27	18-36[2]	—	22	12	9[13]	
Washington	no	12	9	18	30	—	24	6-9[8]	6	0-3[8]
Western Reserve	no	8	0	18	42	36	18	18	18[13]	
Williams	yes	0	24	0	36	12	18-30[9]	12	0-12[9 13]	
Wisconsin	no	10	0	22-50[2]	20-40	—	8-32[2]	8-18[10]	0-6[10]	
Yale	yes	12	0	12	24	—	12[11]	12	12	12[12]

1Option between argumentation and mathematics.
2Depends upon credits presented for entrance.
3Latin or Greek required for admission to the A.B. course.
4In addition student must pass examination showing reading knowledge of either French or German and elementary knowledge of the other.
5To bring the Harvard data in accord with the rest each Harvard year course is here reckoned as equivalent to eight hours.
6180 hours required for graduation: credits reduced to two-thirds their Minnesota value to bring the figures into conformity with the others.
7Mathematics optional with Latin.
8Mathematics optional with philosophy.
9English is included in the social science group.
10History optional with science.
11Six hours of additional work must be done in each of five of the eight fields into which the curriculum is divided.
12This group includes mathematics and English.
13Selected from the two groups, Social Science and Philosophy, Art, Music, etc.

Degree without Latin or Greek

	Degree	Absol. req.	Narrow opt.	Wide opt.	Majors	Minors	Linguistic	Nat. Science	Soc. Science	Philosophy, art, music, etc.
Amherst	none									
Brown	Ph.B.	36-42[1]	3	15-27[1]	30	0	21-27[1]	12-24[1]	12	9
Columbia	A.B.	see Table I								
Cornell	A.B.	see Table I								
Carleton	A.B.	see Table I								
Dartmouth	B.S.	18	48	0	24	0	18	27	21	0
Harvard	B.S.	No La	tin for en	trance	required.	Course	as for A.	B.		
Haverford	B.S.	39	6	12	18	0	24	18	6	9
Knox	B.S.	30	12-18	12-18	20	0	18-24	18-24	9	9
Minnesota	A.B.	see Table I								
Oberlin	A.B.	Must a	dd one y	ear of	Latin to r	eq. in T	able I			
Princeton	B.S.	12	18	0	32	—	6	18	0	6
Swarthmore	A.B.	see Table I								
Washington	A.B.	see Table I.		B.S. de	gree given	to medi	cal stude	nts		
Western Reserve	A.B.	see Table I								
Williams	none									
Wisconsin	A.B.	see Table I								
Yale	Ph.B.	No La	tin for en	trance	required.	Course	as for A.	B.		

[1]Depends on credits presented for admission.

Distribution

A curriculum of the second type seems worth detailed consideration. Are its principles sound and does it work effectively? It is, of course, based on the theory that there are measurable differences in the importance of subjects; that there are branches of knowledge that every educated man must have studied; that it is the function of the faculty to select these subjects, and of the student body to take them without question. Of course, it is true that there are wide differences in the applicability of various subjects to the purposes of the average man. For the general student, no one would put Hebrew on the same plane with French, or mechanical drawing with physics. But with the relatively minor subjects eliminated, there remains an appalling total of those which must be seriously considered as required subjects in any curriculum. Let us ask ourselves the question, with what fields of knowledge should every educated man have some acquaintance? and then run through the list. English, of course, both for command of expression, and for a knowledge of the great works of literature. Languages, of course: Greek and Latin for the immense field of thought opened by them, and for their disciplinary value: French, German, Spanish, Italian, likewise opening great literatures and useful as spoken tongues. Physics and chemistry—certainly; there is hardly a process in every day life which does not have a basis in some reaction explained by them, and they, with the other natural sciences, train in logical processes of reasoning in a way which is all their own. Biology and geology:—who today can be considered an intelligent man if he is unable to discuss with some degree of understanding the problems which these sciences unfold? Mathematics:—is there any better training for the development of logical reasoning, or any subject more useful as a tool? Economics and sociology:—who, in these days of complicated organization of society—an organization whose impact upon the individual is direct—can be without the principles which they teach? History:—surely the present can only be well interpreted in the light of the past. Political science:—every man or woman must be properly equipped for the duties and responsibilities of citizenship. Psychology:—who can know at all unless he has some idea of the workings of his own mind? Philosophy:—obviously that which endeavors to synthesize and correlate all other branches

of learning should not be neglected. Music and art:—every man in whom training in the appreciation of things aesthetic has been omitted sooner or later realizes what a great source of inspiration and enjoyment has been denied him. Biblical history:—its importance is obvious. So we might go on and on; the list becomes tiresome but is by no means at its end.

What are faculties to do when confronted by the necessity of meeting a problem like this: of selecting from these branches of knowledge, each with a recommendation so obvious, those subjects which "no educated man should be without?" It would be thought that some at least would be so preeminent that all could agree upon their inclusion in the curriculum. Nevertheless, in the eighteen colleges included in the statistics of the preceding tables, not one common subject is required by all. English, which most nearly answers the specification, is not prescribed in two of them. Moreover, there is not a single branch of learning mentioned in the paragraph above which is not either absolutely required, or elective with such narrow options as to make it practically so, by some institution or other among the number. As the matter actually works out, each faculty member is honestly convinced of the necessity of his own speciality to the equipment of the educated man. He may, even, through lack of perspective, be inclined to overestimate it. He is also influenced, perhaps unconsciously, by the desire to increase the numbers and prestige of his own department. So he puts forth his best efforts to convince his colleagues that his particular subject should come within the charmed circle. Those whose departments are not affected by the matter tend to decide the question, and the decision of individuals does not in all cases depend entirely on the merits of the case. Even if such merits are the only factors taken into account, who can really decide the question of relative values? The individual in question may win or he may lose, but when he wins, he is likely to unite with those who opposed his demands, through the fear that their own work would be affected, in the defense of the prescribed list against others who try to intrude. We have long faculty debates on the question, granted that subject A should be required, is there any reason why B should not be optional with it: a debate in which all the members of department A oppose the proposition, and all the members of department B favor it; each of them professing his entire lack of self interest in the matter, and arguing

on the basis of the best educational advantage of the student To be fair, such professions are usually quite honest; but the sense of perspective is not entirely without flaw. We have such decisions as that recently made at one college by which in Freshman year English was made optional with a new course in American National Problems; not because there was any congruity between the two which made a choice between them reasonable, but because the only other subject which might be made optional with the new one was Latin, and there was a desire on the part of the majority of the faculty to safeguard at all odds the study of the classics. It is upon such reasons that curriculum building often rests. One individual may produce a curriculum of this type which is perfectly satisfactory—to him. From the nature of the case, five individuals cannot arrive at a compromise which is satisfactory, in all its details, to any one of them, or which any one of them would undertake to defend, in its entirety, as representing what a proper curriculum should be.

The essential difficulty seems to be, not in the principle of distribution, but in the principle that anyone is wise enough to select what all boys must study. After a survey of the situation, one is inclined to place himself definitely in the category of those whom Dr. Meiklejohn bans as unfit for faculty positions by their contention that there is an essential equality in many fields of knowledge. As long as it is contended that there are some subjects which every individual must study if he is to become an educated man, I, as a chemist, am quite prepared to maintain that no man can be considered properly trained unless he knows something of chemistry. I have very definite arguments to support my position, arguments convincing to all chemists, and to some others. My contention is exactly as valid, and will convince as many people, as those of my colleagues who make the same claims for numerous other subjects of study. But I know perfectly well that there are many members of the community who are men of broad culture, who have that degree of intellectual curiosity which distinguishes the individual whose mental processes are active from those who are content to take their ideas at second hand, but men, nevertheless, who know nothing of things scientific, and who take not the slightest interest in learning them. No one could justly dispute their claim to the litte of educated men. So it is with other subjects. We have, all of us, our blind spots. Men differ; the knowledge which is

most worth while to one is worth little to another. Few men there are, however wide their culture, for whom there are not fields from which their eyes are resolutely turned; subjects which to them are unattractive and boresome. No amount of compulsion will remedy this innate deficiency of interest, or will induce those who labor in a field unattractive to them to do the fundamentally irksome tasks in a manner other than perfunctory. The school boy must be made to work, all tasks are likely to be irksome to him: but the college man should be educated and not trained. Unless his interest is aroused, the process of the college is of little avail. Nevertheless, disregarding this element of human nature, and failing to capitalize the innate interests of the individual, we proceed first to the impossible task of weighing what is most worth while—each institution arriving at a different result—and then we fit our conclusions to that most non-existent of all imaginary quantities—the average man. And then we wonder why we are not more successful in arousing the intellectual interest of the student body.

Of course the process does not work. No one who, in a required course, confronts a class of stolid individuals; men who are present in body but not in mind, should be under any illusions as to its success. In general, the more compulsion we exercise upon the individual in the choice of the subject matter which he is to study, the less effective are the results. We seem, by our principles, to have a false notion of the real purpose of the college. Every teacher objects to the spirit which moves the jubilant student upon graduation to throw his diploma in the air with the glad cry "Educated, b'gosh"; but, nevertheless, the theories upon which some of us work quite justify him in his perverted idea. It is the general assumption that the attention of a student to a subject can only be secured by the definite prescription of formal instruction in that subject. We feel that it is essential that a boy should know how senators are elected and in what way the electoral college differs from the college of cardinals, so we prescribe courses in political science; that it is good for him to understand what makes the automobile go, so we prescribe courses in chemistry. But the very existence of such prescriptions is a confession that the college is not succeeding in its purpose of arousing intellectual interest. If that interest were really aroused, the student could be relied upon to seek for himself the thousands of pieces of information which every intelligent man must have,

and which we now labor to impart in these compulsory courses. Taking a formal course in college should mean that the individual has a special interest in the subject, and wishes the help of the teacher in order that he may go farther than he could by his unaided efforts. If we exclude the preliminary work in languages necessary to secure an easy reading knowledge, and, perhaps, the rather specialized and technical training of the natural sciences, there is little in the college curriculum with which the student cannot do much by his unaided efforts—if he wishes. The purpose of the college should be to influence him to wish to do that, not alone in his undergraduate days, but in after life. Instead of assuming that a live student will interest himself in economics, or history, or fine arts, or literature, or Chaldee; that he will take it upon himself to become acquainted with the esentials of the subjects; and that teachers are provided merely to assist him in his quest, we say, you must take Chaldee I, you must in it study given text books, you must do definite readings, you must pass an examination and then we will place to your account in the college bank certain credits to be applied to the purchase of a degree, which will be your claim to the title of an educated man. So the person who is entirely uninterested in Chaldee takes the course in a dogged and sullen spirit; he does the exact amount of work necessary to remove it from his way; and by his presence, and that of others like him, does much to spoil the course for the individual whose absorbing interest in life is the study of Chaldee. Such a process is deadening to the effectiveness of the college.

Far too common are two ideas. The first is the dogmatic statement "the study of .....is necessary to the training of the educated man." The blank is to be filled with the specialty of the individual who makes the assertion. What are the fundamental requirements of the educated man; requirements on which all can agree? He must be able to read and write; he must be able to express himself clearly and with force; he must have a live interest in a wide variety of things intellectual. Such a definition gives clear warrant for but one college prescription: that of English; and that only if the student shows that he is deficient—as he usually is—in powers of expression. It could well be interpreted, however, to admit the requirement that there be evidence of ability to read one or more foreign languages. There might also be some requirement of distribution of studies, without the definite prescription of departments.

That is all—except careful provision that nothing shall be done to smother a growing interest in matters intellectual; a process sure to be brought about in many men if the college works on the mistaken idea that this, that, or the other, must be a definite requirement. The second principle is that every man ought to have a little ..... (here follow a dozen blanks which the reader may fill in as he likes). The emphasis of those who make this claim is decidedly on the word little. What they really mean is a smattering of the various subjects such as can be acquired with little effort, and which, when exhibited, will make an impression only upon those who know nothing about the matter at all. This principle—in combination with the other—when applied to the college curriculum makes it that thing of shreds and patches which the foreign observer so much criticizes. As a matter of fact, it may be doubted if instruction with this definite purpose has any place in the college. If the object of the institution has been attained, the student—or the graduate—will obtain from his own reading the information which he seeks; more, in all probability, than he ever would in a college course in which the object was to impart a "little"—let us say—Chaldee.

The college has no easy task in arousing the intellectual interest of the material which it receives It must capitalize every advantage which it has. It cannot afford, through blind adherence to traditional theory, to disregard the human element in the men under its charge. It must make the most of the interests of its students; it must study them as individuals; it must adapt its requirements to their separate needs. The more it deviates from this principle, the more it sets up arbitrary requirements of the curriculum which all must meet, the more it handicaps itself in the task which it is to do.

Concentration

The second factor demanded by the curricula of most colleges is that of concentration. Through systems of majors or the like, the student is required to do more or less consecutive work in some one department, although the colleges differ much in their estimate of how much this should be. There is nothing wrong with the theory of the system, although in many cases the details are not entirely satisfactory. The main difficulty, aside from the

relatively small amount of work sometimes required for the major, is in the weakness of departmental supervision of its content. In many cases a major consists simply in so many courses selected from a large list of advanced work offered by the department. In general, each teacher in the department has some field in which he is specially interested, and considers it his privilege to offer an advanced course in that field. Moreover, each of these courses must be on a plane of equality with every other. So the student may choose from the list such a selection of units as suits him; and in many cases he need pay little attention to the congruity of the various parts of his theoretically well balanced whole. Such a major necessarily becomes a hodge-podge, which has little effectiveness in fulfilling the purpose for which the requirement for concentration is intended. Only a progressive, well-rounded survey of the field studied can be considered to justify the term concentration of effort. It sometimes happens that a student finds his course progressively easier as the four years go by. If that is the case, a badly planned and carelessly administered major is likely to be at fault. Moreover, except in one or two institutions, there is no effort made to test the student as to his mastery of a given field of concentration. His work, a hodge-podge as it may be, ends for that particular subject when that particular course is passed. The student is never under any obligation, unless his own conscience urges him to it, to cast an eye over the field which he is supposed to have covered, and to ask himself how much he really knows about it. As a result he never attains the mastery which the major is supposed to give.

Chapter XXIV

A SUGGESTED CHANGE

HOW then shall a course of study be constructed which may better serve the real purpose of the college? Curriculum building is no light process and the suggestions here made can only be regarded as tentative, but the following plan is presented for what it may be worth. Although it has been evolved from an independent study of all elements of the situation, it bears a considerable resemblance to the course of study recently adopted at Princeton University.

As has been said, there is nothing wrong in the principle which is at the basis of most college courses. We must always have provision for concentration in a limited field, and for distribution among a sufficient number of subjects that the one-sided development of the student may be avoided. Whatever criticism may be offered centers on the method by which some colleges utilize this common principle. In the suggested scheme, we retain the major, we retain a provision for distribution, we retain, perhaps, a few required courses, despite the objection to them stated above. But we try to modify radically their nature, and to change, if possible, the effect of their impact upon the student.

At the heart of the suggested system is the major; an enlarged provision for concentration which would constitute, more than it now does, the center of the college work. It is the nucleus around which the course is built. The time assigned to it should be increased. The student should devote at least half his attention in the last two years to this field, and in senior year it might profitably be more. But time is not the only feature of the system or even the most important one. A major of the type now common, merely expanded in its quantitative requirements, would be of little avail; the nature of the work is the thing of primary significance. We should reject the idea of building the provision for concentration by adding together separate courses, with no special care that their relation one to another is such as properly to fulfill the

purpose desired. The major should be carefully planned as a coherent whole, and work in it should be directed and managed with that aim always in view. Reasons of college bookkeeping alone make it necessary to divide this whole into separate courses; but the division should stop at that point and should extend as little as possible to an arbitrary splitting of the unit into relatively unrelated parts. Not only should the major be unified, but the work should be conducted in a spirit quite different from that which, at present, is often its animating purpose. The student should be put upon his own resources more than he now is; he should be placed in the attitude of one who must master a wide field, the material being before him, largely by his own initiative. Formal exercises, as the work develops, should more and more be devoted to the synthesis of facts gained, to the construction of a logical point of view, to the discussion of the salient features that develop, and less and less to the purpose of finding out what the student knows. Such exercises in themselves are a sufficient test of whether or not he is doing his work, and the individual who is idle should be dropped from that field of concentration, and left as a result with no place to turn. No pretentious spirit of research should invade the course; it is to be planned, not for the professional scholar, but for the intelligent man of the world. Nevertheless the method by which material in such a process must be handled is essentially that of the investigator, although the problem may have been worked upon by others, and the conclusions reached may be far from new. So, while he will be making no "new contribution to knowledge," the student will be working in the way in which those who do contribute to knowledge must work, and he will be doing it himself. Great lecture courses, with hundreds of listeners, should never be a large factor in the major work; the sections in most cases should be sufficiently small so that flexibility of method can be attained. It would be quite unnecessary to confine majors, in all cases, to single departments; combinations of related subjects might well be set up, if the provision is always in mind that the major must be regarded by those who have it in charge as a unit, and not as a summation of relatively unrelated groups. Definite concentration requirements would thus be established for men with special purposes in view: the pre-medical student would have as his major those subjects which are required for admission

to the medical school; for the embryo lawyer, or engineer, or journalist, schemes could be designed in a similar way for the particular end in view. As requirements of various departments are different, so the majors themselves might differ in length to fit the nature of the case, if, at all times, limits were assigned above and below which they could not go. At the end of the course—although in special cases there might be exceptions to this rule—a comprehensive examination should be set: an examination which should have the purpose of determining the student's grasp of the subject as a whole, rather than his mastery of limited and circumscribed details. Much more stress should be placed on this final test than on any other given in the course.

Such is the scheme for a major: a scheme which would place the requirement for concentration at the very heart of the course. It is intended to accomplish the following results:

I. It should give the student the opportunity of following farther than he now can the line of his special interests.

II. It should enable him to pursue these interests in the way in which a mature man delves into a large problem, rather than that in which a boy does a prescribed and narrowly limited task.

III. It should guarantee, better than the present method, that the product of the college has acquired a considerable degree of mastery of at least one field of knowledge.

With this increased provision for concentration, how shall the problem of distribution be settled? As a matter of fact, if we can set up a major of this type, we need have regard to little more than the single provision that distribution must exist. If we say that a certain portion of the student's work must be in fields entirely unrelated to his major subject, we can leave to him a very large degree of freedom in what he shall choose. There are two requirements upon which we may insist: that he shall have such a command of the English language as to make him able to express himself clearly and forcibly; and that he have a reading knowledge of at least one foreign tongue. Even these requirements are better met by examination tests than by the prescription of formal courses. Thus a student who shows at entrance that he can write with accuracy, clearness, and force, may well be excused from work in English, as is done both at Princeton and at Harvard, while at the latter institu-

tion the modern language requirement is removed by passing definite examinations; in preparation for which the student may adopt any method—college courses, preparatory school courses, or any other which seems to him good. It may be that college faculties will be reluctant to accept a principle of distribution quite so broad as that stated above. Possibly it is too liberal. But the guiding principle nevertheless should be that whatever restrictions are decided upon should not take from the student a very large degree of freedom in making his choice. Further, if a faculty, in setting up these bars, is governed by the principle that this, that, or the other subject is necessary to the training of an educated man, the bars will be so many as to make the system unworkable.

Prescribed subjects would seem to have no place in a curriculum of this kind, but, nevertheless, they cannot wholly be omitted. If all students possessed a maturity which would enable them to choose their work for themselves, the case would be different. But to expect the youth who is fresh from the necessarily schoolboyish methods of the preparatory school to select wisely from the intellectual bill of fare which the college may offer, is obviously out of the question. He still is a boy, he has neither the mental maturity, nor the knowledge of college conditions, which are necessary to make his choice an effective one. So, for his first year, he must be treated as befits his status; in a large measure he must be told what he is to do. Nevertheless, during this time it should be the special object of the college to impress upon him the fact that such methods are at their end, and that in the future the responsibility for his development must rest upon himself alone. During the first year—in essence a continuation of the school—the methods of the school must be used, and during that time a certain prescription of courses seems unavoidable. But even here sufficient freedom should be available so that the student may start at once on lines of special interest to him—if by chance he has any special interests. By the time freshman year is over, through his contact of the college atmosphere, he should have so advanced in maturity that choice may be left to him. If with the knowledge of his coming responsibility before him he does not attain the necessary development by that time, the chances are that real maturity will be slow to come at all.

The scheme then in brief embodies a major which is not only enlarged, but which is carried out in quite a different spirit from

that now common in most colleges; it includes provision for a distribution which is to be as little hampered by requirements as the situation will permit, and it provides a certain amount of prescribed work in freshman year. Obvious objections to such a plan at once suggest themselves, and two or three of them may be discussed at this point.

It will be said that such a curriculum must result in a degree of specialization which is entirely excessive for the college of liberal arts. Such a charge is the most damning one that can be brought. No vision is so frightful to the faculty of the college as the horrible bogey of specialization. We are pitifully afraid that a man who is interested in subject A will devote so much time to it that he will find it impossible to take "a little" of the subjects represented by each of the other letters of the alphabet. Some institutions, with self-conscious rectitude, go so far as to limit, and to limit narrowly, the proportion of a man's course which can be assigned to a given subject, all regulations as to free electives to the contrary notwithstanding. As has been seen, the first reaction of the American teacher who observes the English system is one of horror at the concentration which it seems to require. The amazement of his English colleague at his surprise is equally extreme. To the British mind the prime object of education is to train the individual until he knows at least one thing well. We may, I think, justly object to the results of this attitude as extreme and to their method as overdone, but after all if a man does know one thing well, does he not know considerably more than do most of the graduates of our colleges? It is the intent of the scheme outlined above to obtain some of the advantages of the English system without imitating its extremes. So if it be said that the degree of concentration required under it is greater than is the American practice, the answer is that that effect is exactly the one desired.

The most general and the most pressing criticism of the graduate of the American college is that he is lacking in accuracy, dependability and intellectual resource. How can such a product be avoided if the system by which he is developed is one largely of shreds and patches, and in which any measure of concentration which may be required is secured by methods that are additive rather than cumulative. The student has never had to dig in the field for himself, he has never been expected to survey a large problem as a whole, he has never felt the sense of power

which comes from the conscious attainment of a degree of mastery of some realm of knowledge. Of course he is utterly appalled when, after his college work is over, he is confronted by the necessity of doing just those things; and of doing them well, if success is to be his. We may well ask ourselves, what better preparation for after life can be proposed for the student, than the requirement that in college he must know some one field really well.

It is suggested that some boys at an early stage of their college life are too immature to select well the field in which so much of their time in after years is to be spent; and, moreover, that they are likely to select a field bearing no relation to the work which they afterwards will do. In most cases the first of these difficulties is not due to immaturity but to mental inertia; to the desire to float with the current rather than to put forth the effort necessary to stem it. Nevertheless it is not to be denied that in some cases these things may occur. But after all is it not well that a boy should early understand that the responsibility for the formation of a guiding purpose for his college course is his and his alone; and even that there should be some compulsion exercised upon him to decide for himself what he is to do? If he must choose at this period, is there much likelihood that his selection will be worse than if he drifts through his course, turned now in one direction, now in another by every passing whim; or if on the other hand he is towed through narrow and carefully selected channels by a motive power not his own? Do not such methods offer an undue opportunity for him never seriously to consider the question of his responsibility for his future work? Even if it finally develops that his choice is quite unrelated to what he afterwards is to do—is he worse off if he puts forth valiant efforts in any field no matter what it may be, than he would be if his efforts have been scattered and unrelated, or—what is more likely—if he never has been called upon to put forth any serious efforts at all?

But under this scheme what becomes of the broad general education which the liberal college should give? No one disputes that this is the prime purpose of the institution, but what becomes of it under the present system? Can a college which relies on prescribed courses to give acquaintance with diverse fields honestly claim that its educational theory has met with success? Success in individual cases it can present; but taking the body of

graduates as a whole, and with full regard to the handicaps under which all colleges labor in their task, can any institution look with complacence upon the broadening effect of its educational processes? Is it not rather true that courses narrowly limited, many of them in uncongenial subjects, have the effect of discouraging and stifling whatever intellectual interest may have arisen? As a matter of fact, would not the chances of creating in the student a sense of the appeal of intellectual things be considerably greater if he had before him the opportunity of doing much in a field of his own selection, and doing it in a more attractive way; and of directing his efforts to subjects disconnected from the central one under compulsion relatively limited, and with a choice fairly large? Should we neglect the drawing power of interest in solving our difficult problem? Of course, it will happen that under this sytem some individuals will select an assortment of studies the relationship of which no one could defend. But such cases would be limited in number, and the effect would probably be no worse than that obtained from the way in which such individuals carry out at present the work of the most logically prescribed curriculum. Such cases should not make us resort to the pet vice of American college faculties—that of regulating conditions with the object of preventing the foolish man from doing foolish things, but with the result that all the rest of the college is prevented from doing things which for them are both legitimate and wise.

It is, of course, obvious that the introduction of a plan like this would considerably affect the distribution of the student body among different departments. So long as tendencies remain as they are, it would probably result in an increase in the work taken in English and the social sciences, and a decrease of that in foreign languages and the natural sciences. Departments now entirely outside the list of prescribed or semi-prescribed subjects would also tend to increase. So far as such changes are influenced by the real interest of the student in the subject selected, they are perfectly in accordance with the spirit of the system and are not subject to criticism. If such changes are due to the opinion of the student that the studies to which they go are less exacting than those which they leave, the question is a different one and must be discussed by itself. In either case, the departments which are reduced in numbers are benefited by the change. They can concentrate their attention on men whose interests are keen, and are no longer obliged to carry the great load of the indifferent.

The plan thus suggested is no panacea. It will not work for the lowest stratum of the student body—no plan will be effective for this group. It may not be effective for the rest. But in the attempt to raise the intellectual life of the college to a higher plane, with due regard to the handicaps which must be overcome, it seems fairly certain that the problem can only be attacked by capitalizing those interests which the student may have or may form, and that the appeal of these interests must be worked skillfully and to the utmost extent. That is what the plan attempts to do.

Before its effectiveness can be admitted, two obstacles must be removed: obstacles which require discussion in detail.

Chapter XXV

OBSTACLES TO THE SUGGESTED CURRICULUM THE "SNAP" COURSE

ONE of the most perplexing of the problems of the college curriculum is the "snap" course. It would be easy enough to determine its position—though not to do away with it—if all "snap" courses were bad. Most of them are, but the small remainder may be among the most desirable features of the college. An inspiring personality; one who can convey to others a sense of his power, but who refuses to take seriously the minutiae and details of the curriculum, may stand on the teachers' platform year after year, and stamp on class after class, attracted by the man—and by the fact that no work is involved in the process—an impress which will always remain. In after years, as their thoughts go back to the college, the members of these classes turn to this man with the grateful remembrance, not of what he taught them, but of what he was. Givers of "snap" courses like these no college can afford to lose.

But most "snap" courses are not of this kind. A personality far from great may consider himself such, and may mold his courses in imitation of the other. Or a teacher may conceive the notion that a class room crowded with students, with resulting prestige to the department, may be obtained by low requirements. There is no question of the success of the process so far as the crowds go, and of its failure in obtaining the desired prestige. Or a teacher may be quite blind to what real requirements are, and may conduct a "snap" course, honestly unconscious that it is such, with the result that he is much flattered by his apparent popularity. Whatever the reason may be, the outcome in all cases is the same—a course which is an academic nuisance.

In a curriculum with fairly large and rigid prescriptions such "snaps," if not too numerous, do not constitute a serious problem. But when a curriculum such as that outlined above is involved, the matter is more troublesome. It would not be so bad if only the

dregs of the college resorted to these courses. But it is very easy to create an atmosphere in which it becomes one of the traditions of the undergraduate body that a part of "college life" is involved in the election of certain time-honored "snaps." As freedom of election increases, the opportunities for this kind of dissipation become greater. Even here, unless the "snaps" are too many—and they tend more or less automatically to limit themselves—the difficulty is not a particularly serious one.

Quite different is the problem presented by a "snap" major. If even one of these exists, the scheme which has been proposed will be utterly ineffective. The entire system is based on the idea that there shall be at the center of every course a nucleus of work which is both exacting and cumulative. If there be presented a single opportunity for a major which is easy and scattered, the lower stratum of the student body will flock that way in hordes, and much of the effect of the system in raising the tone of the institution will be lost. Of course it might be possible to follow the Oxford practice, and allow the lazy and indifferent man to go as he likes, without disturbing ourselves overmuch about him. But the American college can hardly bring itself to that method of treatment and it does not seem desirable that it should. Moreover, the Oxford system could hardly work effectively if instruction were less a matter of individual teaching and more based on formally given courses, the tone of which must be kept up to a definite standard. So if the proposed plan is to work at all, every major possible under it must in full degree fulfill the requirements which have been stated above.

Various branches of knowledge differ much in the case with which they may be made to meet such a standard. Some, from their very nature, can hardly be given at all without being given in a way to fulfill the required conditions; others tend to lend themselves to a diffuse treatment which is far from exacting or cumulative. In particular, English is the subject out of which a proper major is most difficult to build, and in which there is the most likelihood of evolving one which is superficial. As it is, we have in many colleges the greatest number of men specializing in this department: many of them for the perfectly proper reason that it is the most interesting to them, and many others for the quite improper reason that it is the easiest subject that they can find. But while, from the nature of the case, it is probably more difficult to set up a real major in Eng-

lish than it is in any other subject in the curriculum, it is by no means impossible. The fact is evident from the success of the English major in certain institutions under the present scheme. Another ineffective type of major is that made up of introductory courses which deal with the theory of the subject, and which are all that they should be, but which then continue with a discussion of the details of isolated branches of it: a discussion largely descriptive and easily obtained by the student from his general reading. Such a major becomes progressively easier as the course continues, and has nothing of the cumulative effect which should be its object to attain. Its weakness is usually not at all due to the inherent nature of the subject, but to the fact that the elements of concentration and homogeneity have not been sufficiently in the minds of those who planned the work.

The success of the proposed curriculum depends so much on the purpose which must animate all majors offered that any department unable or unwilling to meet that purpose could hardly be allowed to give a major at all. That is easily said, but practically to realize the effect is quite another matter. The advantages of freedom of teaching which the faculties of American colleges enjoy are so great that no one would think of imposing limitations upon it. As a matter of fact, there is no authority in the college which can act upon a department, the nature of whose work does not conform to an established system, in such a way that the difficulty is quickly and effectively remedied. If a plan like the one proposed is to work at all, it will do so only if the members of the faculty are practically unanimous in their approval of its principles. Unless we have the condition, first that individual faculty members really understand what the major means and, secondly, that they are heartily in accord with its purpose and its methods, there would be little point in introducing the system at all.

The Arts and Science Degrees

A second difficulty which would stand in the way of the plan proposed, and which, as a matter of fact, stands in the way of the reasonable working of the system as it now is, arises from the distinction made in some colleges between the different types of degrees. From long tradition in America the arts

degree centers around the study of the classics. In recent years Greek has practically lost its place as a requirement, and the peculiar virtue of the degree now depends for the most part upon Latin alone. Nevertheless the demands of those who wish for a general education, and who present for admission no Latin at all, or an amount less than the college requires, are not to be denied. As can be seen from the data of tables I and II, colleges meet this demand in different ways. Amherst and Williams do not admit its validity, and do not provide for such men at all. Brown, Dartmouth, Haverford, Knox, and Princeton provide special degrees for such men, in all cases bachelor of science except at Brown in which it is bachelor of philosophy. Harvard and Yale provide special degrees, but the difference is based entirely on work in the preparatory school; the college requirements for each are the same. The remaining nine colleges award the same degree—that of bachelor of arts—to all. The distinction of title, based on the presence or absence of a classical training, is no longer preserved in half the institutions in this representative list.

In these days an attempt to discriminate between the two degrees is likely to result in one of two alternatives. It may bring, on the one hand, a wild but rather harmless absurdity; on the other it may lead to the imposition of requirements which are definitely injurious to a large number of the student body, and a measurable handicap to the college in the attainment of its purpose. What, for example, is less logical than the award by Harvard of the science degree to those students who do not present Latin for admission, but whose work in science may be limited to a single course; the same requirement that is set up for the student in arts? Is it not time for somebody to rise with great indignation for the purpose of guarding the integrity of the science degree? What system of reasoning has influenced Harvard to differentiate college degrees on the basis of the difference of work done by two classes of students in the preparatory school, while the college work of both classes may be absolutely identical? How far does Oberlin succeed in putting on the student the stamp supposed to be peculiar to the arts degree by requiring him, if he has neglected Latin or Greek in preparatory school, to take *one year* of Latin in college? Such examples might be multiplied, they are illogical enough, but it cannot be said that the results do serious

harm. If we are careful to avoid the pitfall of absurdity, we are likely to adopt an alternative far more dangerous, one by which prescriptions are imposed which have no purpose except the maintenance of the assumed standard of the degree, and which the student is quite justified in regarding as tyrannical. The system at Amherst and Williams—no Latin, no education—may be admirable for those institutions, if they are regarded as a small part of a complex educational system which elsewhere offers relief in all directions. But to say that such requirements are good in themselves, would be to remove the possibility of a general education from every youth who for one reason or another cannot muster the necessary requirements in a single subject: a condition which even those who carry to the farthest extent their devotion to the classics would hardly look upon with favor. Consider the requirement at Dartmouth; a college in which an honest attempt is made to fit the curriculum to the supposed specifications of a given degree. A man enters with an amount of Latin less than that required for the course in arts. Such a man either must do as a part of his college course an amount of Latin substantially equal to that which he failed to do in the preparatory school or he is tagged as a scientist and is required, as a result, to devote to scientific subjects nearly a quarter of his entire college course. He may take as much interest in scientific studies as does the average man in the genealogy of Rameses the Great, but none the less, if he has not the passport of Latin, the college says that he must wear the scientific label, and not only must he wear it, but he must do some work, at least, to justify it. Nor is the student in arts—that is, one who has presented Latin for admission—as free as he might be if he chooses a scientific career. Is it not apparent that in our attempts to preserve the traditional virtues of a given degree, the college is failing to capitalize, as much as it might, the interests of its entering students and is thus placing itself under a heavy handicap in the accomplishment of its purpose?

The extremes to which such a system may lead can be observed in England. There, as we have seen, the arts degree is definitely associated with linguistic work and the science degree is absolutely confined to scientific studies. The same difficulties are encountered—in exaggerated form. At Cambridge and Oxford the minimum admission tests in Latin are so little

exacting that the student of average ability is said to be able to prepare himself for them by study not requiring more than two or three months. After that, if he selects a suitable honors course, he need trouble himself with Latin no more. That is the system reduced to an illogical basis, but one which does little harm. On the other hand at London and the provincial universities, the entrance tests in the classics cannot be passed with such facility. Here a man may enter the university without Latin, but if he does so his course is limited to one wholly made up of scientific subjects, or, it may be, one entirely devoted to preparation for business. In this case the result would seem to be one of gross injustice; which has as its redeeming feature the fact that none of those subject to it sees any injustice in it at all. The assertion—if a student will not take Latin, then he is a scientist—seems to be regarded as a self evident truth by most English educators. At any rate they act on that theory. But that is not the American point of view.

It is sometimes argued that the peculiar requirements of the arts degree must be maintained for its influence in keeping Latin as a fundamental subject in the secondary schools. It is highly desirable that all possible encouragement of this object should be offered, but there seems to be little evidence that this particular means of assistance is effective. It is hardly likely that many students in the school select Latin courses because they lead later to a particular degree, or because as a result of their selection they may receive training of a special type in college. The boy who takes Latin usually does so because his father says that he must, and the father bases his action on the theory that the training in Latin is in itself beneficial. It is doubtful if the classics in school need any other support than is to be gained from the very prevalent and correct idea of their effectiveness as disciplinary subjects, peculiarly adapted to students of secondary school age. At any rate the actual increase in the enrollment in Latin in the schools at a time when it was becoming less and less an absolute necessity for college entrance is an indication that it needs no external support for the maintenance of its position.

After all, has not the nature of the degree quite lost its attracting power? What student worries himself about the various designations that the college may set up, beyond being

concerned with the technical requirements of the particular one which seems within his reach: requirements the purpose of which is beyond his ken. Most people know what is meant by graduation from Columbia and Brown and Dartmouth, and Amherst, but they generally do not know that a man who starts with a certain combination of admission credits, and carries through a course which has as its purpose his general intellectual development, receives for practically the same work in one institution the degree of bachelor of arts, in the next that of bachelor of philosophy, in the third that of bachelor of science, while in the fourth he is not even considered worthy of entrance. If they do know it, they are likely to ascribe the cause to the lack of practical sense which is sometimes considered to be the attribute of the college professor. Who cares in the case of the Harvard man, least of all the man himself, whether he is an A. B. or a B. S.? In truth the old carefully guarded distinctions are gone, and the valiant guardian of "the integrity of the arts degree"—for no one takes much trouble with any other—is guarding an empty shadow from which all substance has long since departed.

It would seem to be the sensible thing to set up a single degree—that of bachelor of arts—for all graduates of the college of liberal arts. If the tendencies of the times are read aright that is what eventually will be done, and there seems no reason why the process should be postponed. Such a solution is logical, and is one which will avoid on the one hand the tendency toward absurdity and on the other that toward unjust imposition of hampering requirements. But if we cannot go the whole way, let us at least relieve the most pressing difficulty at the expense of whatever inconsistencies of logic that process may entail. Let us make no attempt in college to meet the requirements which a particular designation is supposed to demand, and let us determine the nature of the degree, as is the practice at Harvard and Yale, by the work done at the point at which there is a vital difference in its character—in the lower school. Men who enter college to seek a liberal education would thus be treated alike, all would be subject to the same limitations, and all would be offered the same advantages. When the day of graduation came, if different degrees should be given for work precisely the same, no one will be seriously disturbed thereby. We shall

not be logical by such a process, but we shall be fair. We shall not handicap ourselves at the start, through requirements in subjects irksome to him, by imposing such obstacles to the student in his progress through college as seriously to retard the development of any intellectual interest at all.

Chapter XXVI

METHODS OF INSTRUCTION

IF the college is to accomplish its intellectual purpose, in spite of the handicaps which it must encounter, it is obvious that the nature of the courses which it is to give and the methods which are to be applied in making them most effective must be the subject of serious study. It is not apparent that these factors in the earlier days of the college were entirely free from criticism. George Ticknor writes of the Dartmouth of 1807 "I learned very little. The instructors in general were not as good teachers as my father, and I knew it; so I took no great interest in study." Senator Hoar, who entered Harvard in 1842, says of that institution "There was little instruction of value. The good scholars and the bad went to the recitation together. The good ones lost the hour and the poor scholars got the benefit of hearing the good ones recite." He goes on to describe the recitations in Latin and Greek in which the efforts of each man were limited to the translation of a few lines of the text, and most of the time was spent in the agonized efforts to complete their part of the job put forth by those incompetent and unprepared. Of course good teachers were not uncommon, and great ones not unknown. Any system will yield good results with such men, but the system itself, at its worst, led to such educational advantages as might be obtained from a method by which the teacher asked the student to repeat verbatim paragraph three on page 211 of the text book, and that student was judged most efficient who could reproduce the words of the author with the least possible change.

The Lecture Method

With the introduction of new subjects into the curriculum, and with the advent of a class of teachers who had received their advanced instruction in a foreign university, came a new method of teaching: that of lectures. Because of certain advantages in the system it soon gained a predominant place in the class room

of the American college; in particular in that of the college which is a branch of a great university. While a reaction from this extreme position is under way, and while the defects of the system are becoming more and more a matter of universal recognition, it is still true that the students of our colleges are lectured to far too much, and that the ineffectiveness of the institution in doing what it is supposed to do comes in no small part from this cause.

The reasons for the almost universal application of the lecture system are very simple; it is attractive to the administration of a college because it is relatively inexpensive; and it is attractive to the teacher because it is easy. In these days when, in most colleges, the numbers which knock at the doors are far more than the funds of the institution permit it to care for, it is difficult to resist the temptation presented by the presence of a method by which a single teacher is in a position to take care of the training of as many students as his voice can reach. To some teachers it is a most attractive idea that they can simply talk and talk with no interruption from anyone; with no necessity of concerning themselves with the difficulties of individuals, and with no chance that a smoothly working schedule by which they calculate that they may "cover the course" may, in any way, be impeded. A teacher of this type is usually conscientious enough in the performance of his duties; he toils without rest over his material, he endeavors to assemble it in the best possible form and to deliver it in the best possible way. When he has acquired, by experience, an idea of the method by which these things may effectively be done; and when, in addition, he acquires some notion of the average scale of intelligence of the men under him, so that he will not shoot too high or too low, he may become a good lecturer—or he may not. It is really surprising how many men of the latter type—some of them men of long experience—are lecturing in our colleges. It is one of the most common of delusions that anyone who knows, can teach. Teaching, even the easiest of all types—that of lecturing—is an art which only can be attained by long experience; and, like other arts, is to be acquired by some men not at all. So, we have at the lowest end of our scale men who from incompatibility will never be teachers; others who consider elementary teaching as beneath their dignity and lecture in as perfunctory a fashion as they can; still others who from inertia are content to repeat year after year, with scarcely the change of a word, the material which at some time they have

put together with the intention of having it last through life: and a few even—these often men of eminence in their specialty—who write all they know of the subject in question in a text book, require their students to buy the book, and then drone on from the manuscript of it with hardly a new thought or even a new expression. At the upper end, on the other hand, we have men who have acquired the art of lecturing, men who know both the strongest appeal of their subject, and the psychology of those who listen. It is fair to say that the number of the latter class is sufficient to make the general level of teaching in American colleges at the present time higher than it has ever been before.

It is not to be assumed that the lecture method is without its use in the undergraduate college. There are few courses from which it could be entirely excluded; there are some in which its application should be very general. In advanced work, courses taken by students who already have a considerable knowledge of the field and are earnestly laboring in it, instruction by lectures is the most fruitful method. In other words, the system of the graduate school may well be applied in the undergraduate college to those who can profit by it. So, too, introductory lectures are advisable in most courses; lectures which serve to explain what is to be done, and, if possible, to imbue the student with some degree of enthusiasm for the work which is before him. Frequently through the course the tangled threads can be caught together, the progress which has been made can be noted, and its effect on what is to come forecasted, by the lecture method. The synthesis of material already obtained can best be carried out in this way. In scientific subjects the experimental lecture has its place. And then we have always the teacher of the inspirational type, the man whose personality makes an impress on the student, the individual who discusses literature and the one who talks of geology, while all flock to hear, but who might exchange subjects with no detriment to their effectiveness. Such men should be allowed to work on as many students as they can, and the lecture gives them the widest opportunity of doing that.

But while we assign the lecture its due place in the college system, if we attempt to carry it farther and to make the real teaching of the American student depend upon this method of instruction, we shall encounter definite and unmistakable failure. It simply will not work. It never does work even in those institutions which most stress it. If anyone doubts this statement, let

him select that lecturer among his colleagues who he considers most able, let him sit among the students of his courses and observe the reaction of really effective lecturing upon them. He will find on the part of most a real interest. But it is a passive rather than an active interest. Many make no attempt to take notes at all; those who do, in many cases, achieve marked success in noting non-essentials at the expense of things really important, and unbelievable ingenuity in perverting the sense of what is said to a meaning often exactly opposite that intended. The only way in which a lecturer can be sure that a point which he wishes to make shall be noted by a majority of his students is to say that it will probably be on the examination: a process utterly absurd as a method of education, and one which leads some students to put it down right, and some to put it down wrong, and some to put it down not at all, but to rely on somebody else to do so for them. The student trained in the lecture method wants outlines, synopses, briefs; the gist of things prepared by someone else; and he wants to use them not as guides for the mastery of the subject, but as guides as to what will be asked on the examination. That lecturer is considered best who best predigests the material of his course, and presents it in the smallest compass; in other words, who does for the student exactly that which is of the most benefit for the student to do for himself. If it is the habit of the teacher to place before the student outlines of this sort, he will find no lack of response; the student laboriously writes down the material and considers the work of the day over. Then he uses the outline not as a brief from which to study the subject, but as itself the subject matter of the course. It is amazing how unintelligently some students will act if they suspect that they are obtaining material of this kind. It would be perfectly safe for a teacher of chemistry to wager that if, previous to his lecture, he placed before the students a list of the presidents of the United States with the dates of their births and deaths, some, at least, of them would industriously note down the information, and not even express wonder at its nature. It is not fair to the undergraduates of our colleges to accept all the uncomplimentary things that are said about them. They are far from being so black as they are painted, but in this one respect they are at their worst. As long as the American student remains as he is, the lecture system as a method of instruction will never be effective in his training.

Of course it should work. The theory behind it is perfectly

satisfactory. Jones is studying economics. The lecturer, let us say, has announced that he will talk next time on the law of diminishing returns, so Jones looks the matter up in his text book; if he is earnest he may find out what other books have to say about it, and comes to class with a fairly definite idea of what it is all about. The instructor, relying upon this study, devotes little time to the statement of the principle, but proceeds at once to its applications, to illustrations, to its bearings on what has gone before, and to what topics it may lead. Jones keeps his pen going, he has found that no matter how fast the instructor talks, he can get down all the leading principles, and some of the illustrative matter. After a week or so of earnest effort he has really learned how to take notes. But he knows that notes lose their meaning unless the material is worked up within a reasonable time, so that night, he goes over what he has written; he may expand it a bit, but he finds that he has at his command about all which was said that really counts. With the process thus applied he should and does gain from his instruction exactly what he needs. The lecture system has thus made the proper contribution to his education development. That is the fairy tale. As an actual fact, the process works out more like this. Jones doesn't bother to look up the matter before he enters class. Why should he trouble himself; the teacher is paid to do that. Nevertheless his father, who is in business, has had much to say about returns, so Jones has the hazy idea that the law of diminishing returns relates to the income tax, and must be a decidedly unpleasant subject. The instructor, relying upon previous study, states the law briefly; Jones hastens to write it down, but gets stuck in the middle. Mentally cursing the teacher for going so fast, he consults his neighbor on the left, who has failed to get as far as he; while the one on the right hasn't written anything at all. By the time the consultations are over, the lecturer has got so far ahead as to be out of sight. With a sigh that indicates that the material is in his opinion "heavy stuff" he resigns himself to an hour of boredom. But suddenly he catches an idea from the language flowing above him, and hastens to write in his note book "If you fertilize a garden you get diminishing returns." Satisfied with his grasp of the subject he leaves it at that until the last possible moment, and then in preparation for a test puzzles his brain over what fertilizing a garden has to do with the income tax. So he buys an outline and hires a crammer in the attempt to find out.

This picture is extreme, but not more extreme than can be found by every lecturer among the less industrious of the men of his class. The system simply does not work. In those institutions in which it most prevails, we find most evidence of the success of those academic camp followers who sell synopses, and who furnish private instruction. There we find on the part of the student least evidence of steady consecutive work during the course, and the greatest signs of feverish activity at the time of examinations and tests. If we examine the situation, we can come to no favorable conclusion as to the merits of the basic process involved. As long as the reaction of the American student to the lecture remains as it now is that system should have as a means of instruction but a restricted place in our colleges.

Recitations

If the lecture system is to be thus rejected, we seem to be compelled to fall back on the scheme of recitations. Such was the method of the college in earlier days; a method which at least presented the advantages that under it every man in the course took an active part in the exercise of every day. Even now it is usually found necessary to supplement lectures with frequent exercises held in small sections, the conduct of which is more or less according to the recitation method. From the necessities of the case, these sections are likely to be intrusted to the most immature and inexperienced teachers; a process which is sure to work badly because there is no demand made upon the teacher that requires more skill and experience than the successful conduct of such work, and there is no point at which the art of the successful teacher can be applied with greater effectiveness than at this. Of course he who is a failure in the conduct of lectures makes a failure which is more spectacular than he who succeeds ill in recitations, but it is doubted if his depressing effect on the student body is so great. One is tempted at times to believe that the process might well be inverted, that the least experienced men should give the lectures, and the most competent should direct the more informal exercises. But that is a plan which is not likely to be adopted.

Recitations are intended to serve two purposes: the less agreeable one of finding out whether or not the student has

done his work; and the more dignified task of removing the difficulties which the individual may have encountered, and, in general, of working over and discussing the material under consideration. The former purpose was the one mainly in mind in the early college. Even with this end largely in view, it is impossible for a really good teacher, one who keeps his class at all times on the alert, to conduct such an exercise without profit to all concerned—or for a really poor one to run it to the profit of anybody. But it is a distasteful task, and the common complaint of college teachers is that we spend an utterly disproportionate amount of time and energy in finding out how much the student has actually learned. Every teacher experiences at times a feeling of utter discouragement as he surveys his activities, and estimates to what an extent he has to do with patrolling the field of knowledge, and seeing to it that the students under his charge have not broken loose to saunter in what to them are more pleasant paths. The feeling is justified, but it seems to be clear that in some degree the process is none the less necessary. One who has had to do with the American undergraduate for many years may have had his sense of proportion warped through centering his attention too much on these at the lower end of the scale, but nevertheless the peculiar difficulties experienced by those institutions which devote least attention to the process of testing day by day what the student has done are somewhat discouraging to those who think of imitating their example. If the system is to continue as it now is, there seems to be little chance largely to reduce this irksome part of the teacher's work. Without over optimism as to its success, it is hoped that the curriculum suggested above might do something to lessen it. At least in the major work the attempt might be made with some chance of success.

It is in the second of the purposes of the recitation that we find the real strength of the method. The true teaching of the college is done at this point, and the real teacher here has his best opportunity. The enthusiastic lecturer who observes the rapt interest on the faces of the hundreds before him: who can feel—as every experienced lecturer can—a sense of rapport between himself and his hearers, and who thereby is stimulated to increased efforts, may flatter himself that his work is fruitful; but if he actually tests the results which he has produced upon these interested listeners, if he really takes pains to discover

how much they have absorbed of the material so carefully set before them, his discouragement is likely to be profound. But if the same man is faced with a group of fifteen; if the atmosphere is one of informality; if the bars between pedagogue and pupil, so far as possible, are removed; if opportunity is open for discussion, for questions, for disagreement; then he will succeed to a far greater degree, and he will know that he has succeeded. So great are the advantages of the method, that no college which wishes to do well the work that a college is supposed to do should fail to stress such a process.

Small Sections

After all we find ourselves at a conclusion which is so platitudinous that it seems hardly worth stating: a conclusion to which most of those who have written on matters of education have come, but the logic of which is still neglected by many of those who have our colleges in charge—that teaching is really effective only if sections are small and if instruction is so far as possible individual. The classic illustration of Mark Hopkins, the student, and the log teaches more than is usually drawn from it. The place of the log in the process has been too much neglected. No doubt Mark Hopkins was effective before an audience of hundreds, but that effectiveness was far increased by the chance of individual contact. As a matter of fact if sections are small, any method of instruction is a matter of indifference: and all methods are likely to be used. The teacher may do the talking, if that seems the best method at that particular point—though he should always guard against the temptation to talk too much—; he may switch to questions which determine the students grasp of the subject; he may introduce topics which lead to discussion. The student at any time may state his difficulties, he may raise objections, he may contribute his own ideas. Of course the exercise must be made a general one. The shy individual must be encouraged tactfully to become a real part of the group, and the stolid and uninterested youth must occasionally be hauled to the surface to see if his mentality is really as dead as it seems to be. But if the process is well carried out, it affords ample opportunity for the class room to be what it really should be; a place in which the student, with the guidance of the teacher, is the active agent in his own education.

Of course the smaller the sub-divisions into which the college is divided for the purpose of instruction, the greater the expense. Some institutions, with small sections in view, definitely limit their enrollment to the numbers which their resources permit them to care for by this method; although curiously enough it is not always true that large endowments and small numbers always result in small divisions. In other cases, the problem is more difficult. It should be possible, however, for an institution which really desires to make the small division the center of its work eventually to reach that goal, if it sternly represses the tendency to turn its attention to multifarious lines of activity, and to resolve to attempt to do no more than it can do well. On the other hand, the difficulty of obtaining competent teachers for many divisions is one not so easy to solve. The importance of good teaching increases as the chances of personal contact become greater. If an excellent teacher produces his maximum effect with the small division, so there the poor teacher does the most harm. It is sometimes made a defense for the lecture system that by it the good teacher has the opportunity of influencing the maximum number. Good teachers are not so common as might be wished and there should be no tendency to limit their activity. This objection is perhaps one most difficult to meet and must be discussed more in detail in a later chapter.

Number of Courses Taken

In general the American college has come to a fairly definite standardization of its work. Three exercises a week is the ordinary allotment of time to each course, and generally five courses are carried by the student in each of the four years of his college career. In fact, this arrangement has become so fixed, and the preparation of schedules has come so much to depend upon it, that it is found very difficult to overcome administrative objections if any other assignment of time is desired by instructors for the individual courses. In some institutions, however, deviations from this general rule are in vogue. The requirements for the degree at Harvard are such that most students carry but four subjects through the greater part of the course. At Princeton, by the recent change in the curriculum, the number of subjects in the junior and senior

years is reduced to four. The time thus made available is supposed to be spent in supervised reading, but as a matter of fact it is said that each instructor has so increased the requirements in his own courses, that whatever reading is done is superimposed on work as extensive as that formerly required. McGill, on the other hand, requires six subjects in freshman year, but this number is reduced to five in the next two years and to four in the last.

We have already seen what the teachers in the Scotch universities, and in some of the institutions of England, think of a system of this kind. It is considered by them quite impossible, with so many unrelated subjects to be considered by an individual at a given time, that justice can be done to any one of them. The scattering of effort entailed by the method seems to them highly undesirable. On the other hand it is believed by American teachers who favor this distribution of interest that it avoids the monotony which comes from the exclusive attention to a limited number of tasks, and results in a fresher interest in each one undertaken.

Whatever the merits of the issue may be, it is apparent to those who observe the American student, that he is far from being overworked. In fact, his leisurely attitude toward his studies is one of the most common complaints against the college. This very weakness is viewed in two different ways by those who would remedy it. Some would increase the courses required until a sufficient number were taken to keep everyone busy; others would materially reduce the number and require considerably more work in each one. Probably neither of these schemes would be particularly successful unless the whole undergraduate spirit were modified, and if that spirit were changed for the better, the number of courses taken would be rather immaterial. It should be so calculated as best to fit whatever educational system might be adopted. It would seem that in a curriculum of the nature of that suggested in the previous pages, the five course method is satisfactory enough for the first two years, but after that, as the importance of the major increases, the number of subjects required might well be reduced to four.

Chapter XXVII

LEARNING vs. THINKING

WHATEVER technical system is used in the college of today, the complaint brought most vehemently by thinking undergraduates against the American institution is that it is mainly a machine for training in acquisition, and not so much as it should be an organization which requires or even encourages the proper use of the material acquired. The student is required to learn, he is not required to think. Lessons are assigned and tasks are set: lessons and tasks which are definite and circumscribed; information gained is treated as information merely to be returned precisely as it is absorbed, and he who best carries out that mechanical process stands highest in the estimation of those who administer the college. These critics place definitely upon this point the blame for the low estate of intellectual interest in the college, and bluntly say that students are not interested in their studies, because those studies are not developed as a means of intellectual training, but mainly as exercises of the memory. They maintain that so long as the college largely confines itself to the accumulation of material which the student is never called upon to use and which he soon forgets, it can have no reasonable chance of fulfilling its purpose. Their remedy is simple. The college should concern itself very little, in its formal exercises, with tests which serve to show how far the accumulation of fact has proceeded, and should concern itself very much with the application of these facts to the purpose for which they were gathered. Real education, the training of the thinking faculties, and not the temporary storing of the raw materials of education, should be the guiding purpose of the college; and her method should be mainly by class room discussion, rather than by formal "instruction."

What has the college to say in refutation of this charge? It must be confessed that it has very little. It must be admitted that in many courses—perhaps a majority of them—the impress upon the student is exactly that which is described above, and that, as a result of it, the valuation of the central purpose of

the institution is much impaired. We have seen that the graduate of the American college who attends Oxford or Cambridge finds in this point the most essential difference between the two theories of education, and he finds that difference is not to the advantage of his home institution. We do too much concentrate on facts; we do too much fail to use them after they are obtained; and we wonder why the undergraduate does not learn with enthusiasm the facts which we do not require him to apply.

But while this weakness must be admitted, we must proceed with great wariness in any attempt at remedy, lest we fall into difficulties much worse than the original ones. The truth of the matter is that too many people have an utter disdain for facts. "Of course" the critic says, the facts must be gathered before use can be made of the material; "of course" there must be something to discuss before discussion can be effective. But there is no "of course" about the matter. Not only among the student body, but among the American people whose spirit it reflects, the desire to get all the facts which are involved in any issue, and to weigh them carefully before coming to a decision, is the rarest of all qualities. There is no difficulty in finding examples of the prevailing tendency. Consider for instance the attitude of the so-called liberal press. Facts, indeed, are in much demand; and be it said in justice, are not often misstated; but those which support the theories of the organ are grossly over-emphasized and over-drawn, while those which oppose it are slurred over, and minimized, so that while no direct misinformation is given, the whole effect is much the same as if it were. The conservative press skillfully uses the same facts in the same way to convey precisely the opposite impression. Neither is anxious that the truth shall prevail; each is engaged in contorting truth to serve a definite purpose. The most difficult thing in the world today is to obtain the simple statement of the facts in a controverted case. The mental process of most of us is to form a theory based on prejudice, or on sense of its advantage to us, or simply on our general habit of thought; we then valiantly stress all the facts which support this theory and resolutely neglect all those which contradict it. We are in general perfectly satisfied with the result. So the statement "of course" the facts must be gathered, etc., is not the self-evident truth which it is assumed to be. The more reasonable "of course," if the

American student reflects the environment from which he comes is that "of course" they will *not* be so gathered.

Nor is it always true that it is necessary to have anything to discuss before the discussion begins. At any rate, in American public life, discussion seems to proceed often times with little knowledge of the facts of the matter and with little desire to learn them. If we mean by discussion a careful weighing of all the elements of the situation by men anxious to reach the truth, that is well and good; if we mean by it the attempt to convince by the art of the advocate, and with the one-sided point of view of the advocate, the result is thoroughly bad. America is full today of "causes"; their virtues urged by propagandists concerned with convincing the public of the validity of their claims, and not at all concerned with a careful and impartial estimate of the weight of evidence in the matter. Appeals to sympathy, to prejudice, to self-interest are easier to make and are more effective than are the laborious collection of fact and the careful weighing of evidence, and in every controverted issue, political, religious, and economic, the dispassionate observer is likely to be disgusted with the nature of the case presented by either side. Let us by all means have discussion in the colleges, if it is real discussion; but if it leads to a product highly skilled in the technique of argument, and experienced in presenting effectively a case with little logical background, let us revert to the method of former days. We need in the world men who, in college, have been trained to know and to think. If the institution fails in either respect, it is justly subject to criticism. Nevertheless there is a choice of evils. The graduate who knows, but does not think, is a rather useless member of the community; he who thinks, but does not know, is a positive menace to it.

Nor is the appeal presented by the student critic, reasonable as it is, entirely without its bad effect on the college as a whole. The work of finding facts and marshalling them into shape is no easy task, and, like most of the rest of us, the student finds the job irksome. The appeal for less emphasis on mastering the material and more upon its utilization strikes a responsive chord in his heart; less emphasis means to him no emphasis at all; and he is enthusiastic in his approval of such a relief from drudgery, supported as it is by the high sounding appeal to the cultivation of his intelligence. He is all for thinking as opposed to learning, quite unconscious of the fact that thinking is a

difficult process, and one to which he is quite unaccustomed. He loses respect for facts as such because he considers them beneath his intelligence. "Factual" courses are held by him in no esteem. Instruction in some subjects must be predominantly of this character. You may discuss until you are hoarse the third person singular of the French verb "to be" but the form will remain the same despite all your efforts. The fact that some things really are known and settled is troublesome to men of this stamp. The natural sciences are particularly "unpleasant" in this respect. The idea that when a reasonable deduction has been formed, instead of accepting it and proceeding to build others upon it as a basis, you can and must subject it to actual test—a test which nine times out of ten proves it to be wrong—interrupts most harshly the genial flow of reason. Nor is it encouraging to be told that knowledge must be complete to be of value, that information ninety per cent right is worth exactly nothing at all. Nevertheless the physician who knows all about arsenic, its chemistry, the tests for it, its physiological effects, the ailments for which it should be prescribed, but who is a bit uncertain as to the dose, and rather thinks it should be a teaspoonful, is more likely to land in jail than is one who knows nothing about arsenic at all. More and more men come to college who wish to discuss, but do not wish to take the labor to acquire; their idea of an "agreeable" subject is one in which so little is known and the results of which are so little subject to proof or disproof, that speculation may proceed at will without unpleasant tests of the validity of results. This spirit in college is the cause of that most common criticism of the graduate—that he lacks respect for accuracy. We do not require the student to master facts because we expect that necessarily he will remember them in after life. We do so rather that he may understand their fundamental importance in any problem that is to be solved. If a successful graduate returns to tell one of his old teachers that he has long ago forgotten the science which he learned, that teacher, before retiring to put an end to his existence from chagrin at the ineffectiveness of his efforts, may well ask how the individual solved some difficult business problem which has recently confronted him. Perhaps it will develop that he laboriously dug up all the facts of the case, that he carefully correlated them, that he drew deductions from them which suggested to him that other facts

might be looked for which would confirm or contradict the inferences upon which he was proceeding: that as a result of this careful systematic collection of information, and of reasoning from it, the remedy for the situation was not difficult to find. If such is the case, the teacher may restrain his suicidal hand because of the suspicion that the "forgotten" course may have had some slight influence on the matter.

So, whatever changes are made, the college must not lose sight of the principle that the finding of facts is the basis of all knowledge; that respect for fundamental data is the first step in the process of education; that no labor is to be spared in obtaining all the material which bears upon the case at hand; that if this is not done, the most acute reasoning will lead to no desirable result. If the college succeeds in implanting that idea in its students it will have done much in starting the man on his path as an educated man.

But, nevertheless, such a method serves to start the process only. With all respect to the importance of fact, as the college actually works, the student complaint of over-emphasis upon this phase of education must in many cases be regarded as justified. It is an over-emphasis, not because the collection of fact is itself unduly stressed, but because little or no emphasis is placed on anything else. It is not that fewer facts should be learned; but that more use of them should be made when learned. There is no particular reason for learning facts as such: they are of value only as they are applied. If, in a college course, instruction stops at the fact-learning stage, the student is not far wrong in his complaint that there is no particular reason for the existence of that course. Consider the way in which much of the college work is conducted. Numerous facts are stated, which the student learns. They seem to lead to a general principle, which is stated as law A. The student learns that. In a similar way from other facts law B is developed, which is learned in the same way. Then the instructor carefully outlines the reasoning from these laws which seems to lead to the establishment of principle C. The student learns the principle C, and also the reasoning of the instructor. And then the best explanation we can find for A, B, and C is theory D. This is also carefully developed by the instructor; he shows why the theory is reasonable and other theories are less so. Again the student learns theory D and he also memorizes the reason why.

After all this, if he is a very high grade man, he can reproduce the whole thing verbatim; but in his study of the matter no exercise of any mental process save that of memory has been called for. He probably has no idea that any difference exists in the mental process required by the various steps. Fact, law, principle, theory are learned by rote, and all are on a flat dead level in his mind. That is not a process of education at all. But if the instructor, by judicious guidance, not overdone, can induce the student himself from the laws to evolve principle C, and then perhaps theory D, or, what is just as good, a supremely absurd theory E—the absurdity of which soon becomes evident to its author if his attention is called to certain points which it would involve—then the student is made to feel that he becomes an active part of the process; that he is doing something himself; that he is no longer the blank wax of the record, impressed by the recording needle with the furrow which afterward is to reproduce unchanged every cadence of the original tone. There is the chance that he may get quite interested in the matter, so much so that he begins really to feel that intellectual exercise is no unpleasant task. There is likewise the chance that he becomes utterly disgusted by the new idea, and sadly looks back to the good old days when learning lessons was the method of the college, and when no one was prodding the unwilling student to think. The number in the latter class will not be few.

Some courses exist to which, from their nature, such a process could not be applied. In most it would be effective, in large measure or in small. With no lessening in the demand for full acquaintance with basic material, but with less time spent in finding out about it, with the lecture system largely abandoned, with the opportunity for individual instruction increased, with each instructor imbued with the idea that the individual student must, through his own efforts, do much, and with the student aware that his work is such as to require his active participation in a real process of education, there is much hope that the intellectual stimulation of the college would act upon a larger number of men than it now does. There is also the certainty that the unambitious and the incompetent would do less well than they now do. Their lack of ambition and competence would produce results, which, from an educational point of view, might not be worse than those now attained, but those results would be more conspicuous. When its bearings

were understood, the change would be decidedly unpopular with a large class of the student body. But there seems to be little question that by the more general adoption of such a method the tone of the institution would be raised, and it would accomplish more successfully than it now does the purpose for which it stands.

Chapter XXVIII

EXAMINATIONS

IN American colleges the examination is stressed, in general, to a lesser extent than it is in English institutions. We have our course examinations, and there the matter usually ends. A comprehensive test of the English type, one which is supposed to sum up the entire work of the student during his college career, is not common—although the introduction of such examinations is a subject of serious discussion at the present time. Our interest at this point, however, is in the ordinary course examinations. Later the comprehensive test will be a subject for special comment.

It must be confessed that examinations, as we now conduct them, are often not as satisfactory in their results as one could wish. If there is any part of the work of the teacher which becomes more and more irksome as time goes on it is the task of setting examinations and of reading the papers that result. It is the experience of many that such work is looked at with distaste and is attacked, when it can be delayed no longer, with a marked lack of enthusiasm. As a result the papers evolved are often perfunctory, they are lacking in novelty, and are such that the keen student and the keener crammer find little difficulty in forecasting from the papers of past years the essential nature of the paper of the present. So the advantages which should come from examinations are not realized to the extent that they should be.

In England, as we have seen, this laxity in the preparation of the paper is much diminished by the almost universal provision of the external examiner. As these examiners from outside are never numerically a large element of the examining board, they can hardly be provided for the purpose of testing the work of the teacher as well as that of the student, as is often thought to be the case. The effect of their presence seems to be simply that of keeping the level of the test to the required mark, and of making it more probable that examinations will not fall into those stereotyped lines which are not so uncommon with us.

Conditions are so different in American institutions, however, that it seems doubtful if the advantages to be gained by the introduction of the outside examiner would be worth the trouble involved.

Nevertheless it is probable that the examination as a part of our educational machinery may be made to fulfill its purpose in the scheme of the college more effectively than it now does. It is doubtful if at any point of our present system increased care on the part of the teacher can be made to yield more fruitful results than at this. A process by which the general level of examinations is raised requires time and thought, but both the time and the thought will be found to be well spent.

Particularly fruitful in their promise are examinations of the new type: those in which the length of answer is reduced to the minimum, in which blanks are filled in, or sentences completed, statements are marked true or false, or the correct answer is selected from a list of possibilities. Such examinations offer many advantages. They are fair; they cover a large amount of material; they require little time in the actual process of writing; and their reliability is a demonstrated fact. They can easily be made tests of reasoning power and of the use of materials. They are generally approved by the students, despite the fact that they constitute much more exacting tests than do examinations of the ordinary type. It is obvious that the process of cramming is an unsatisfactory method of preparation for such tests, and the utility of the hired tutor (if he is hired for the purpose of cramming rather than of teaching) is practically nil. Lack of ideas cannot be concealed by a mass of verbiage, as the student—perhaps over optimistically—is inclined to think can be done in examinations of the ordinary type. Really to do well in the new kind of examination, the student must have done the work of the course from day to day with care and diligence. It is true that the preparation of such tests require on the part of the teacher considerably more time and attention than do those of the ordinary variety. It is an interesting practice in ingenuity to work out a sufficient number of questions of this type, and it can not be done with haste. Moreover it is dangerously easy, even after the most careful inspection, to allow questions which admit of ambiguous interpretation to slip in; questions which are fatal to the whole effect of the system. Unless the work is to be well done it is better

that it should not be attempted at all. But if it is well done the results usually show that the effort has been worth while.

Perhaps the most general use of such examinations is made at Columbia. With no attempt to induce members of the faculty, either by compulsion or by persuasion, to use such a system, the advantages of the plan were laid before them, and ample opportunity was given for those who wished to try it to do so effectively. Although there was much scepticism at first, these examinations are now in very general use. Three quarters of the departments are now said to make some application of them—and many of those who at the start were the most violent opponents of the system now are its enthusiastic supporters. One check only is put upon its application. All papers before being printed must be submitted to the inspection of an expert —the professor of collegiate educational research—whose duty it is to see that the pitfalls into which those unacquainted with the new type of test might be likely to fall, have been avoided. In general it is found that the agreement of results between various tests of this sort is much closer than can be secured by two examinations of the usual kind in which conscious effort has been made to insure that they be of equal difficulty.

Some subjects are less adapted to this method than others; probably there are cases in which it cannot be used at all. But it is of more general applicability than might at first be thought. It is of course quite unnecessary that the essay type of question be entirely excluded from the examination, should such questions be considered desirable. It is perfectly possible to combine the two methods in a single paper in whatever proportions seem best adapted for the purpose in view.

Whether or not the new type of examination is to be more widely used, there seems to be no question that examinations of any type whose main object is merely to ascertain how well the student has learned the material of the course should have a very restricted place in the college. A test of the student's capacity to reproduce the material which he has studied is a test of his industry and memory, and of nothing else. The criticism of the method of the college which has been stated in the preceding chapter finds its most striking justification in the nature of the college examination. If the student is asked to learn facts mainly because he is to place them on an examination paper when called for, we have difficulty in defending

such a process as a method of education. That is surely not the intent of any college course, but the effect of many courses on the mind of the student is to make it appear that the purpose of the work is exactly that; or, at any rate, if they follow the process of memorization, and do little else, the results seem to be quite satisfactory. All of us probably have been guilty of such questions as those beginning with state, define, describe, develop, etc.: questions the answer to which require nothing but an effort of memory. It is doubtful if questions of this kind ever should have a place on any college examination. They constitute no test of intellectual capacity. Of course the student must know the facts, the laws, the theories; but to ask him to state them is a useless performance. Let him be required to build upon them; let him show not only that he knows them, but that their utilization is not entirely strange to him. Instead of asking him to state law A, or law B, let us ask questions to answer which he must not only know the laws but he must know what they are good for. That is as good a test of acquisition as the other; and it tests something besides. At least one logical step beyond the point which is covered by the mere information involved should almost always be required. Questions of this kind test knowledge of the facts as well as those of the simple type; but they test in addition the really vital matter: has the fact been of any particular value to him who has acquired it. It might not work at all times or in all subjects, but in the majority of cases may we not form the guiding principle that every question on the examination should require for a satisfactory answer some degree of independent thinking on the part of the student? If such a theory were followed, would not our courses gain in dignity and in scholarly tone? And is not the result worth the extra care and attention which must be paid to the preparation of the examination if it is a result that can be gained?

Chapter XXIX

SPECIAL TREATMENT OF FRESHMEN

THE peculiar task of the American college makes it necessary that special care be taken in the handling of the material which enters. The freshman comes from the preparatory school with an outlook on education which is that of the boy; it is the function of the college so to work upon him that his outlook becomes that of a man. It is obvious that, at first, he cannot be given the liberty of selection which is calculated for men of greater maturity, nor can the same method of treatment be applied to him. On the other hand it is highly desirable that college work should from the start appeal to him as something quite different from that to which he has been accustomed in the lower school, and that his first year be so designed as to make the transition from the ideals of the school to the ideals of the college as rapid and effective as possible. It is easy to fall into two errors: that of continuing the schoolboy method of treatment too exclusively and too long, and the opposite one of treating the freshman as one already ripe for the method of the college in its entirety. Both of these extremes are dangerous. It seems necessary so to plan the work of freshman year that a certain measure of the discipline and guidance of the preparatory school is preserved; but with the aim always in view that the student must early attain that maturity which will enable him advantageously to employ the greater degree of freedom necessary to the effective working of the college.

Many institutions recognize the necessity of guidance at this critical period, and, in different ways, try to furnish what seems to be required. At Brown and at Dartmouth special deans have charge of the freshman work and the attempt is made, through faculty organization, to watch the entering student with all possible care. It is true that this process may result in over-coddling, and thereby defeat the purpose for which it was intended; but on the whole the outcome seems satisfactory enough. At Williams and at Harvard, freshmen are housed by themselves in special dormitories, while at Dart-

mouth they have their meals together in a common hall. It is at Yale that the most careful attempt is made to meet in full the peculiar demands presented by the entering student: an attempt which in part may be due to conditions merely local—the desirability of unifying more than formerly was the case the rather conflicting interests of Yale College and the Sheffield Scientific School—but the general methods of which are applicable to any college. Not only is a special dean provided, but also a special faculty; and a faculty in the selection of which the most careful attention is paid to that ability and power to teach which is most indispensable if immature students are to be properly treated. In theory, at least, the demand for good teaching is the predominant one, and only teachers of well tested efficiency are selected. These men are organized into a separate freshman faculty; a coherent body definitely animated by a fixed purpose. The general control of the permanent policies of Freshman Year—such matters as curriculum, rules and regulations—is entirely in the hands of this group. The freshmen are housed in dormitories by themselves, each with its faculty proctor, and they have their meals in a common dining room. The plan really results in the formation of a small college for freshmen inside the larger one. The success of the system seems fairly well assured. If criticism can be offered, it centers around the point that freshmen placed by themselves, without the benefit of the leadership of upper classmen wiser in their judgments and less flighty in their action, are likely at times to be carried to extremes, and to do, in the mass, foolish things, and things very troublesome to the college. Such developments are not unknown at Yale, but they are perhaps not serious enough materially to detract from the value of the policy as a whole.

Of course freshmen need individual guidance, not only in their choice of work, but in all sorts of other ways. By one method or another, most colleges have made attempts to meet this need; and it must be confessed that most of them, so far as can be made out, have had little success in their efforts. Harvard has both faculty and student advisors; the latter selected by the student council from members of the upper classes. Thus each freshman has two individuals to whom he may turn for help. At Yale the system is one of faculty counselors; men chosen from the ranks of the younger instructors. Each counselor is given a definite grant of money for purposes of entertainment and it is said that the

student, with this sum in mind, is not entirely free from the tendency to regard his counselor mainly as the source of a carefully calculated amount of entertainment. At Columbia frank recognition is made of the fact that the natural source of contact between student and instructor is the class room. Working upon that idea the teachers in the required course in Contemporary Civilization act as advisors to the freshmen in their particular sections. At Haverford an advisor system of the ordinary type is said to be effective; but in other institutions it is the general feeling that such a system results in relationship which is merely perfunctory and in some cases, after due trial, it has been abandoned.

The truth of the matter seems to be that such a relationship, imposed as it is from above, has little chance of success. If the advisor is to serve as a guide to the student as the latter attempts to thread his way through the technicalities of the curriculum, he usually does a poor job, and his efforts result in more harm than good. Such work is better done by those who are hired for the purpose, and who therefore stand some chance of being able accurately to do it. If the relationship is to be that of a companion and friend, the result can only be obtained if a sense of mutual liking on the part of the two men is at hand: a liking which can only be derived from congeniality of tastes, and which can never be counted upon if the relationship is based on arbitrary assignment from above. It is entirely desirable that there should be such a feeling between teacher and student as to lead each to seek the companionship of the other; but that result can only be reached by spontaneous growth between men of common interests and of common tastes. If this friendship is to be obtained, the only effective method by which it can be fostered is to increase the opportunity for real contact. Too much is not to be expected from any method, but the system of small sections, and of the more general application of the principle of informality in the class room, ought at least to make more frequent the chances for the discovery of elements of congeniality between student and teacher.

Courses of a General Nature

The last ten years have witnessed in the colleges a general tendency to introduce courses which have as their purpose the

survey of a wide field. They are planned to afford the student an idea of what a subject is about, rather than to enable him to enter deeply into it. These courses are of a number of different varieties and are by no means limited to freshmen, but they may best be discussed at this point.

The first type of special work to be considered—the orientation course—is eminently reasonable in its general idea. The student is assumed—rightly— to know very little of the field of knowledge, and consequently is unable to select with good judgment the part of it which is likely most to appeal to him. He is like the mariner on the open sea without chronometer, or sextant, or compass, or chart. At the start of his college career he must survey the field of knowledge, he must see the relations of the parts to the whole, he must be able to view the curriculum with a proper sense of perspective. That purpose the orientation course is intended to fulfill. As a result of the illumination obtained from it, the freshman can enter upon his real college work with less uncertainty; and he can form a reasonable basis upon which his choice of studies may depend. Such is the theory; but when applied it seldom works. In particular when such a course consists of lectures by heads of departments, each of whom, in the student eye, appears as the "booster" of his own specialty, the result is dire and utter failure. Such courses never last very long. In fact, in the institutions visited only one orientation course was found to have survived; and that of a type quite different from that mentioned above. The work bearing this title at Brown consists of eleven lectures which all freshmen must attend. The subjects of these lectures seem well worth mention. They are as follows:

General Instruction and Advice
The Aims of the College
History of Brown
Student Activities
How to Use the Library
The Cause of Disease
Manners
How to Succeed in College
Problems of Personal Adjustment
The College Man's Reading
The College Man's Religion

The reason why this course has survived where others have failed seems to be that it is very sensibly managed. Originally it consisted of twenty-six lectures and was designed along lines which have just been described. As such it was hardly a success. But from year to year the effect of each lecture was carefully

watched, and those which did not seem to produce the desired result were dropped the following year. In this way the number of exercises has been reduced to its present point, and the lectures which survive are the ones which the students themselves regard as really worth while. No college credit is given for the work, and no examination is set, but note books are examined twice during the period of the course and he whose note book is not acceptable must come again the next year. As now modified and reduced, the course is said to accomplish its purpose reasonably well. It is certainly evident that if a student actually absorbs material contained in lectures like these he profits much thereby.

Another type of course suggested as a requirement for freshmen is one on "How to Think." If we grant the argument, already advanced, that the college should demand of its students the use of the intellect, rather than merely that of the memory, then it is often the case that the freshman is not aware that he has an intellect, or, if he has one, that he has the slightest idea how it should be used. To tell such a man to think is like placing him in an aeroplane and telling him to fly. The technique of the process must be explained; he must know how to handle his mind if the results of his thinking are to be otherwise than futile. The assertion is made that it is possible by formal instruction to do much to stimulate and aid the formation of correct mental habits. No institution, so far as was observed, requires work of this kind. Carleton College offers a course in "How to Study," which seems to be both popular and effective; but it is an elective subject. There are many who maintain that such courses never can attain their purpose; that if a boy comes to the age of eighteen with twelve years of school experience behind him and has not learned how to study or how to think, there is little chance that he can be taught to do so by instruction in the class room. But there are others who say that the student's lack of thinking power is due to the fact that he has never been told how the process is to be carried out. It is fairly obvious that the college receives too many students who do not think and study enough; but whether such men are to be regarded as defective, and therefore need to have the defects remedied, or whether they are to be considered as unwilling, and need to be spurred on, is a difficult question to decide.

The most common type of general course is that which has as its object the survey of a given field. In two institutions such

work is an absolute prescription. Columbia requires all freshmen to take a course in Contemporary Civilization; five hours a week for a year. The work is entirely by the recitation-discussion method; with no lectures. Dartmouth requires three hours' work for one semester in Citizenship and as much in a course in Evolution. In these courses, particularly in the second, the lecture method is more widely used. Other institutions give similar courses, which are elective within a narrow range of options. Thus Williams offers a course in American National Problems; optional to freshmen with rhetoric; one lecture and two recitations per week for the year. This course is elected by about half the freshman class. At Amherst the course in Social and Economic Institutions is in a group of three subjects, two of which must be elected by freshmen. At Yale work is given in Introduction to the Social Sciences, three hours per week for a year, less hedged by requirements than in the cases above, and for the present limited to two hundred students. This work is conducted as a combined lecture and recitation course, but the latter feature predominates.

It will be seen that most of these courses have to do with the political and social sciences. The course in Evolution at Dartmouth is the exception. It is the habit of those who know nothing of natural science to demand that courses shall be given with the design of giving a "little" information concerning the essential nature of such subjects; and this demand has always been resisted by teachers of science as impractical in itself (within the time limits set) and as undesirable, in that information so slight leads to a perverted notion of the subject as a whole. The course in Evolution mentioned above is not a course in general science; but one which is centered about a particular theory.

As might be expected, opinions vary widely as to the effectiveness of these general courses. That at Columbia is perhaps the one to which least objection is raised within the walls of the institution itself. The Dartmouth course in Evolution has always been the subject of criticism both on the part of students and of faculty. But recent discussions with younger alumni reveal the fact that about the only point of their college careers concerning which there is a fair degree of agreement among them is in the effectiveness of this course in doing well what it is supposed to do. While from many theoretical considerations there is reason to believe that it ought not to work, the fact seems to be

that it does work. Any course of which this can be said has gone far to justify its existence. On the other hand there is emphatic opinion on the part of college teachers to the effect that some of these courses are trivial, that they are popular only because they are easy, that they are regarded with ridicule by those who take them; and that they are supported only by those who look upon them from the viewpoint of theory without regard to practical efficiency. There is but one similarity in the opinions of those who discuss such courses, and that is in the firmness with which they are held.

If we consider the question from an unbiased standpoint we find that there is justification for the views both of the advocates and the opponents of such courses. In them instruction is so scattered in its effect that it is sure to hit at some time every student exposed to its influence. From this fact comes their common designation as "shot gun" courses. A shot gun is an excellent weapon of its kind, it has very definite uses, but it is dangerous rather than effective if the hunt is for big game. It is not necessary for the college student to be after big game at all times, but he must not fail to make it the main object of his quest. So, while we may include the comprehensive course, when it is found to be effective, as a desirable part of the curriculum and one which serves a useful purpose, it cannot be made a feature of prime importance. It is well enough to know a little about many things but the man who knows a little about many things and not much about any one of them is not the type of graduate which the college should produce.

It may be well to note at this point other varieties of general courses offered by certain colleges. This work is not intended for freshmen but for men of the upper classes. We find at Columbia a well planned course in the History of Science, to be taken only by men who already have some knowledge of scientific subjects. Here also, is a general course on Introduction to Reflective Thinking and one on the Study and Interpretation of Religion, the latter given in conjunction with the Union Theological Seminary. At Wisconsin is a widely elected course, under the supervision of the department of philosophy, on the Relation of Man to Nature. At Carleton we find the course Man's Place in Nature, conducted by the departments of astronomy, geology and biology; also an Introduction to Chemistry intended for seniors who have had no science, and an extremely popular course

in Art in Relation to Life. At Oberlin a course in the Appreciation of Art is a required subject. In general instruction tending to increase the importance of the aesthetic element in life is more stressed in the western colleges—not the state universities—than elsewhere. The list might be extended if other institutions were included, but it is already sufficient to show some of the tendencies of the day.

Chapter XXX

THE COMPREHENSIVE EXAMINATION
THE TUTORIAL SYSTEM

IT has never been the habit of the American college to subject its students before graduation to a comprehensive test: a test which requires them to sum up the major work of the course, and to show with some definiteness their degree of mastery of the subject as a whole. The English method of placing the emphasis almost exclusively upon requirements of this kind has never, until recently, gained following in this country. We have been content to do our work piece by piece; to make each of the forty courses required of the student a separate unit, with its own specifications, its own information, its own tests; and to consider the matter over when those tests and requirements are met. We have made the degree depend upon the accumulation of separate "credits," many of which need have little bearing on the others and, with the requirement only that these credits, on the books of the registrar, reach the required summation. He who has passed History 24 or Psychology 15 has really "passed" them for good, both in his estimation and in ours; so far as we are concerned he need never return that way again. As President Lowell says, we are endeavoring to measure the volume of water in a leaky bucket by gauging the amount poured in, without any consideration of that which escapes. Such an accumulation of credits we call a process of education, and when the holder of a sufficient number cashes them in for a degree, we expect that degree to be regarded seriously as evidence of intellectual attainment. It often is: more often, in fact, than the process leading to it would seem to warrant. But it is nevertheless true that the college interposes to the acquirement of her honors no bars which are a serious obstacle to the man who memorizes and then forgets, who studies but does not reflect, who absorbs facts but never understands their bearings.

If we dissociate ourselves from the habits and the tradition, of our environment, and consider the matter in the light of reasons

does not the process which we follow seem absurd? Is not the necessity of a requirement by which the student must show at the end of his course that he has attained a mental maturity and breadth of view commensurate with the opportunities which the college affords so obvious as to be beyond question? Suppose one, unhampered by clogging tradition and the influence of things as they are, were to construct the curriculum of a new institution in the light of reason alone, would not the necessity of the adoption of a principle of this kind be almost self evident? Is it not reasonable for a college, while it may allow its students to choose that subject which seems to them best, to require in that field steady, consistent, unified work, and to demand at the end of the course evidence of a comprehension and mastery, not of isolated parts, but of the thing as a whole, that shall be a real warrant for the assumption that is involved in the possession of the degree? Is it not desirable that the degree should mean at least that? For that matter, are we fair to the men under our charge or to the public from which they come, if it means anything less?

Our machinery is now so complicated. By passing courses men accumulate credit for "hours." But that is not enough: the minimum passing standard is too low; it is necessary that the general quality of work be higher than that. So we give points as well as hours, the number of points for each hour depending upon the grade of work, and then we set up a standard of points which must be reached before the degree can be attained. So if the man has 122 hours and 220 points, the degree is his. He regards himself, and the community regards him, as an educated man; but if he has 121 hours and 250 points or 130 hours and 219 points, it is not enough. He must return, not for more education, but for more credits; not for more learning, but for a degree. Or the system may be one in which a certain portion of the marks must have reached a definite grade if they are to count; so that a given course passed at 69% avails if three other courses of the same semester are graded above 70%, but is of no value if one of the three falls below that figure. The motives which have inspired college faculties to set up these regulations are creditable enough, and the regulations themselves are indispensable, if the present system is to work at all, but oftentimes the results are wildly absurd. Most of all, with all these requirements, we never absolutely demand real mastery of even one subject: a minimum requirement for the college degree which can hardly be regarded as excessive.

Should we not gain by changing the point of emphasis? Courses must be passed, and the standard both of the teacher and of the college should be one which requires of the student a reasonable degree of industry and intelligence. But if this requirement is fulfilled, cannot we concentrate most of those demands for work superior to this minimum standard upon the enlarged and improved major? If we require the student to show evidence that he has a very considerable degree of mastery of the subject to which a large part of his time has been devoted, shall we not accomplish all that we effect by our present system, and shall we not avoid thereby the absurdities into which that system tends to lead us? To do passable work in a number of subjects; to do good work and much of it in one; and to show in that one some power of independent thought—are not those more reasonable standards than those which we now set up?

Of course, as the examination becomes thus important, it is necessary to be sure that it is an adequate and reasonable test. It must not be one which puts emphasis upon a multitude of details, nor one in which memory has the largest place, nor one so limited in its content as to give occasion to unfairness. It should not be simply a summation of the various major courses, but a test in which their correlation is ever kept in mind. It should minimize details and concentrate upon principles; but principles applied and correlated, not principles merely learned. It should be one the preparation for which by the intensive study of a few selected topics would be quite impossible, but one which should offer no difficulty to the individual who honestly does the work of the major subject in the spirit which that major requires. It is no simple task to set examinations of this kind, nor can it be satisfactorily done in a hurried and perfunctory fashion, but it can and should be done. The student who has before him the necessity of a test like this, if he prepares himself properly to meet it, can hardly fail to gain from his college course a mental grasp and sense of accomplishment which is not at all called for by the spotty requirements that we now have.

The feeling that tests of this kind are not only desirable but almost indispensable is a growing one among American teachers. Everywhere the question is under discussion. In the system of honors courses, to be discussed in the next chapter of this report, such examinations are a necessary feature. For the ordinary student, however, they are far from common. Among the institu-

tions visited, but two have gone so far as to introduce such tests as a requirement for the degree. The experience of Harvard and of Princeton in the matter is therefore of very considerable interest.

The system of comprehensive examinations was installed at Harvard in 1915-16. It was limited at first to the Division of History, Government and Economics. More recently it has been adopted by the linguistic departments, so that now mathematics and the natural sciences are the only majors in which the test is not used. There has never been entire unanimity in the Harvard faculty as to the workability of the method, but there is evidence to show that the objection to it is growing less year by year. Nevertheless the science departments seem unanimous in their oppostion to the principle, on the ground that in their field all work is by its nature cumulative, that each course is a review of what has gone before, and therefore that there is no necessity of a general test to sum up and correlate the work of the course as a whole. The unanimity of those teachers of science on this point, however, should not be taken as an indication that even in such courses there is no argument on the other side. The examination is built upon a major rather larger (six out of seventeen courses) than is general in American colleges. In all, about two thirds of the graduating class are now subject to a comprehensive test. In 1923 of the 460 men who took such examinations 44 (9.6%) failed to pass them. Such men are given another opportunity to take the examination again at the end of a half year. The test is mainly a written one, but some departments give in addition an oral examination. If this is done, the oral work is usually perfunctory except in the case of men who are candidates for degrees "with distinction" and those whose grading as a result of the written test is a matter of some uncertainty.

The examinations themselves are set in each department by a board of three; made up of Harvard teachers with no representatives from outside. The examiners in the Division of History, Government and Economics are selected by the Corporation; those in the linguistic groups by the department concerned. The members of these boards are relieved of a portion of their teaching, and are expected to devote a considerable part of their time very seriously to this work. When the plan was first put into effect the possibility of obtaining examiners of the right type was regarded as somewhat uncertain. In general, however, little difficulty of this kind has been encountered and usually the examinations are

considered to meet the situation in a satisfactory way, with only an occasional complaint of one which is too much of the nature of a test of information. It is, however, a common criticism that the work for the comprehensive examination is superimposed on the other requirements for the degree; and the opinion is common both among the faculty and the student body that the arrangement would be more effective if the regular work of the course became progressively less in the last two years; leaving at the end more time for the preparation for this special test.

Tutorial Instruction

The question at once arises: how are students to be fitted to meet satisfactorily this test? The Division of History, Government and Economics at Harvard, in its consideration of the system, came to the conclusion that it would work only if special provision were made for individual teaching of the student. Therefore it made as a condition to the acceptance of the whole system of comprehensive examinations the requirement that some provision should be made for a tutorial instruction. As a result, from the first such tutors were provided, and provided at a very large expense. When the system was extended to the linguistic departments (including English), this demand was not vigorously pressed; in some cases there was decided opposition to tutors at all. Even if the desire for tutors had been unanimous, it could not have been answered because funds at the time were not available. At present, as a result of two or three years' experience with the system, it seems probable that the majority of the members of these departments would be glad to have the tutorial system extended to their fields; but, as yet, no money has been obtained for the purpose—and a great deal of money is required, if it is to be done at all. So the undergraduates in Harvard are now divided into three catagories: those who must pass a comprehensive examination and are given special tutorial assistance to meet it; those who must pass the examination but who have no such assistance; and those who are subject to no comprehensive test at all.

The tutors in the Division of History, Government and Economics now number about twenty. The group is made up in part of teachers in the university, of all grades from full professor down, and in part of those whose entire time is devoted to tutorial work. The board is organized under a chairman who has

very considerable powers of oversight and control. All tutors have rooms for their work in a common building; they meet weekly for discussion, and the work is as much standardized as is compatible with a retention of the individuality of the tutor. The board is in close touch with the president; to whom they may report directly—without departmental interference—recommendations for whatever modifications of the system seem to them desirable. In a similar way they express to the examiners their impression of the examinations, together with suggestions for modification or change of scope of the papers in the following year. Each tutor who devotes all his time to the work is supposed to look after forty students. Of course men who do regular teaching have this number reduced. The usual time given to each student is a half hour a week; in the sophomore year the conference may be in small groups, later it is usually by single individuals. The student is at liberty, however, to ask for more time and he is always given it. He is usually content with the assigned conference in the early part of his course, but in his senior year—as the examination approaches—he is likely to demand greater attention. The tutor is never supposed to act as a crammer, and the evidence is fairly conclusive that he usually does not. The purpose of his work is to supplement and direct the efforts of the student, to suggest reading, and to discuss difficulties, so that the individual becomes sufficiently the master of his subject that any reasonable comprehensive test offers no terrors to him. It was assumed at the start that no attention need be paid by the tutor to the material covered by the courses of the class room, that the instructor of the course would look after that. This assumption was not found to be justified, and some of the efforts of the tutor have to be directed to assistance in the digestion of material already formally presented. But the main stress is still on subjects not directly covered by courses, and particularly on the correlation of the work.

When the plan was put into operation it was thought that no particular difficulty would be experienced in securing competent tutors. This belief has not been found to be justified. While plenty of men are available, it is not so easy to secure those who meet the requirements peculiar to a tutorial system. In the past there have been some very thorough failures among those engaged in the work, although the present group seems fairly satisfactory. The position of tutor, however, is to be regarded as

a temporary one, and he who starts with tutorial work alone, although his position and rank in the faculty are on a par with those of the ordinary teacher of the college, cannot help but regard his situation as a mere stepping stone to the more permanent status of a teacher. There must, therefore, be a considerable amount of change in the tutorial staff each year; a disadvantage which is not encountered in the tutorial arrangements at Oxford and Cambridge, and one which tends to diminish the effectiveness of the system. It is inevitable that a tutor should be judged, to a certain extent, by the success in the examinations of the men of whose work he has been in charge. Naturally he regards these results with extreme interest, and it would seem to be a natural tendency for him to look upon the examination as the direct end which he has in view, and upon which his efforts must center. In other words, he might well become a coach rather than a teacher. Despite this temptation, there is little evidence that such results actually take place. The spirit of the system is quite against such treatment and it is said that the students—after the first—do not ask for it.

It is of course not easy to find out just how the undergraduates regard the tutors. It seems fairly certain, however, that the approval of the method is fairly general. The statement is even made that students in some cases neglect their regular class room work for that directed by the tutor. On the other hand, there is some evidence that a rather natural, but unfortunate, viewpoint is not entirely absent. The theory of any tutorial system is that of intimate and friendly relationship, but the inclination to look upon the tutor as all teachers are looked upon is too strong to be resisted, and in many cases personal intimacy is not a large element of the situation. Of course at Harvard, as elsewhere, the student is extremely critical of the teacher, and the tutors are no exception. Some of them are judged to be, from incompetence, a hindrance rather than a help. There is even the disposition to think that many have never done the reading which they recommend—a weakness which is, however, considered to be due to the fact that they are overworked. But on the whole the student judgment of the system is rather more favorable than might be expected.

The preceptorial system at Princeton was evolved in a different way. Instead of being rendered necessary by the comprehensive examination, it was established long before that

measure was thought of: for reasons quite disconnected with it. President Wilson was impressed with the fact that the student in the natural sciences derives an especial advantage from the personal attention given to him in the laboratory. He wished to extend to students in other subjects some measure of the advantage which the laboratory worker enjoys; and the preceptorial system was the result—a result, however, that is still very incomplete. One Princeton administrative officer characterized the catalogue description of the system as a "pious fraud." By that he meant not that the principle is bad, but that, from lack of money, its application is so limited as by no means to justify the common notion of what Princeton is doing. As a matter of fact, it is used to its full extent in but few departments. If the resources of the institution permitted its application to all departments, as it is to some, this individual is of the opinion that the problem of college education would be solved. Preceptorial aid has never been given to freshmen. It is not supposed to be necessary in courses of science. In some departments it has been used to increase the number of teachers; but the increase has not been so applied as to modify the nature of the course in the direction of individual attention. In other subjects, owing to the press of numbers, the preceptor simply runs small recitation sections of the ordinary type. In still others the nature of preceptorial work perhaps has never been properly understood, and the method—in the opinion of those of other departments—is not applied to its maximum advantage. And in some, although it may be handled in different ways by different departments and by different members of the same department, it is applied with intelligence, and works well. It is obvious, however, that this residual portion is but a small part of the university as a whole.

In the department of English, in particular, the method is very effective. Here each instructor, no matter what his grade, does preceptorial work, and the three-hour course is usually made up of two exercises of the ordinary sort and one preceptorial hour. The conference is never, as at Oxford, an individual one, but is made up of groups numbering from four to seven. That there may be something to talk about, topics are assigned in advance; and the instructor prepares in his own mind three or four openings to use if they be needed, but in general, with proper guidance, the discussion is allowed to range where it will. The numbers in these conferences are small enough so that all can be made to participate

in the discussion, and large enough as to give a variety of points of view, and to make the discussion really worth while. It is to be borne in mind that this preceptorial hour is never to be conducted from the point of view of the recitation, nor is its object the same. Failure to recognize this vital point is sure to lead to failure of the system. It is said that the students really enjoy the preceptorial hour and participate in its work with a genuine zest. The system is an interesting example of the superimposition of the tutorial method on that of formal courses, and as such is quite different from its prototype at Oxford.

Upon the basis of this system—already in effect for many years—a new curriculum has lately been put into operation. It is not necessary to discuss the details of this course of study. As has already been said, it bears a considerable resemblance to that suggested in an earlier part of this report as a desirable process to follow. The essential feature is an unusually exacting major, one which requires two of the four courses of junior and senior years. The number of courses in these years is thus reduced below that generally required and the time gained by this reduction is supposed to be occupied by independent reading in the major subject. The provision for such reading is regarded as a definite and necessary part of that work. To direct this reading, a supervisor is assigned to each student: a teacher in the major department, whose duty it is to suggest what should be read and to discuss with the student the results of his efforts. The relation in this case is quite different from that of the preceptor and the objects are not at all the same. As a result of the reading, the individual guidance of the supervisor, the work of the regular major courses, and the preceptorial instruction received therein, the student is prepared for a comprehensive examination in that major: a requirement which he must meet before the degree is his. This curriculum has not been long enough in operation so that any definite judgment can be formed as to its success. Certain developments which are already apparent seem to show that, like all new systems, it needs various adjustments and modifications before it can work smoothly. Thus the complaint is made that each upper class course is seizing for itself a portion of that part of the student's time which is designed for independent reading, so that the latter feature of the curriculum is not having a fair chance. Moreover, a complaint has already arisen from the undergraduates that in many departments the supervisor is

really acting as a dictator and that the term "independent" reading is one of those pleasing fictions with which college faculties are wont to beguile confiding youth. But these criticisms have to do with the details rather than with the essence of the system, and are probably capable of satisfactory adjustment.

Such is the story of tutorial instruction in the two institutions which have done most in this country to develop it. The system has its ardent partisans; but it has its vigorous opponents: the latter by no means absent from the faculties of the two universities in question. The objections are very similar to those which are urged against it by its English enemies. The main argument is that with the ordinary student the results gained are by no means commensurate with the efforts put forth: that it costs too much and gains too little. Fortunately here, for once, we do not have carefully to weigh and measure in the attempt to decide a perplexing question: which, when decided, only perplexes us the more in our attempts to satisfy ourselves that our decision is reasonable. In this case, the result is the same whichever way we decide: a result due to circumstances quite outside our control. As a matter of fact, the tutorial system is utterly impossible for all but the most wealthy institutions for two reasons: first, because it costs too much; and second, because if extended very far the number of available tutors would be utterly inadequate. So the ordinary college, in view of these obstinate facts, does well to concern itself with the problem not at all.

But even if the practicability of the tutorial system for most institutions is settled in the negative, have we thereby necessarily dismissed from consideration the comprehensive examination? If we rely on the example of institutions which have introduced such a test we seem to have done exactly that. But should our reliance be exclusively on such examples? If we admit the advantages of the comprehensive test, should we dismiss it from consideration because, though we may stand a fair chance of getting some of these advantages, we do not feel that we can get all. It is to be admitted that the utility of individual instruction for the intelligent student is great. Whether or not it is worth what it costs in the case of the man whose intelligence is mediocre or worse, is a debatable question. However that may be, is individual instruction an absolute requisite if we are to require of the student that control of his major subject which we have set up as almost imperative? There are those who will say that it is;

but their statements are mere assertion; reasonable perhaps, but assertion none the less. In fact, there is evidence to the contrary. Half the men who take the comprehensive examinations at Harvard have had no tutorial instruction. It is true that such instruction is regarded as highly desirable, and would be provided if the money were available; but none the less, even without it, the results are considered well worth while in themselves. As a matter of fact, the failures in such examinations are no more numerous than those in similar tests in the preparation for which tutors have been employed. And this condition is reached in an institution in which instruction is largely by the lecture system, and in which contact between teachers of experience and students, from the nature of the situation, would seem to be relatively slight. In the light of this experience, the outlook seems far from dark. If a college plans a major system of greater scope than is now usually the case; if the courses in it are planned as a definite unit; if sections are rigorously kept small; if the method of discussion plays a leading part in the exercises of every day; if men are required to think as well as to learn; if they know that a comprehensive test is before them; if that test is well planned and fair so that the man who has control of the subject as a whole finds it no difficult barrier; is there not a reasonable chance that the system would be a marked success? Is there any doubt at all that it would be far more advantageous than the one under which we now work? At any rate, are not the advantages to be gained of sufficient promise to justify the college in going far and doing much in the attempt to make them its own?

Chapter XXXI

THE TREATMENT OF EXCEPTIONAL STUDENTS THE HONORS COURSE

THE American college has never solved in a satisfactory way the problem presented by the student of exceptional capacity. It has been so much engaged with the education of the mass that the special demands of men of high mental power have been relatively neglected. It is obvious that such men are, of all students, the most worthy of attention, and that efforts directed toward their training are most fruitful in their results. As it actually works, inasmuch as members of this group meet the regular requirements of the curriculum without effort, and are never in scholastic difficulties, they are the very ones to whom the least attention is paid; while our most careful efforts are concentrated on those who, from lack of mental strength or from indifference, are experiencing the greatest difficulty in their college work. Of course such a method is defended by no one, but none the less, by force of circumstances, it is a method which is rather general with us all.

As has been so clearly pointed out by President Neilson of Smith, our difficulty is that we do not take sufficiently into account the difference in mental pace which characterizes human intellects. It is estimated that if a definite mental task is submitted to a college group—one from which those of the lowest mental calibre have been excluded by the tests of entrance—it will require for its mastery six times the time for those in the lowest part of that group that it does for those in the highest. In our college requirements we set a standard which can be met by those of low mental capacity only with the utmost difficulty and by the expenditure of an unreasonably large amount of time; but it is a standard which is a proper one only for those somewhat below the mid level of intelligence, and is utterly inadequate for those of superior mental capacity. The latter group, therefore, find the work of the college pitifully easy of accomplishment, and encounter not at all demands which are commensurate with their capacities for performance. The result is not always bad. The

man of ambition may use the time, so much of which is at his disposal, for self-education of the most profitable type; but even if he does, he would probably profit by more guidance and assistance than he now has, and the habit which he may acquire of regarding the ordinary requirements of the college as trivial, is good neither for him nor for the institution. On the other hand, we find that many men of this group make no suitable use of the abundant leisure afforded them; and, as a result of their college experience, form habits which are no small handicap to them in their subsequent careers.

Moreover, in order to make the work of the college effective, it has been found necessary to set up in the institution, for the guidance of the students, a complicated mass of rules and requirements: rules of attendance, rules concerning concentration and distribution, tests, written work, examinations in the various courses, complicated requirements for the degree, and the like. We are continually telling the undergraduate what he must do and what he must not do, and we devote much of our energies to the effort of making sure that he follows our instructions. One unused to the matter is in despair when he endeavors to unravel such requirements as are set forth in college catalogues and college regulations. There seems to be no way in which this complexity can be avoided: it is the only method yet found by which the general mass of students can adequately be handled. It is a method which does no harm to the rank and file. But to the man who is possessed both of superior ability and ambition to use it, these regulations are often a distinct handicap. In the endeavor to do something which is perfectly reasonable and desirable for him to do, he is always encountering barriers, set up because it is not reasonable or desirable for the average student to do those things. He becomes impatient of the whole situation, and begins to look upon the college as an institution which devotes itself very largely to the imposition of gratuitous handicaps upon the man who is really best able to utilize its opportunities and most desirous of doing so.

Regarded simply from an educational viewpoint, the ideal college or university is one in which all rules are eliminated. Neither should there be any degrees. The university would simply be a place in which were assembled facilities for study—libraries, laboratories and the like—and learned men who would be available for the assistance of those who wished to learn.

Any individual who desired to improve his mental status would be at liberty to resort to these institutions; he could do exactly as he liked, he could stay as long as he liked, he would be allowed access to those facilities which he cared to use, and he would be assisted by those men for whose assistance he asked; and when he went away, what he would carry with him would depend entirely upon his own efforts. In other words the institution would bear a close resemblance to the university in the days of its origin. Such an ideal, of course, is not practical in these times, nor indeed desirable, when we consider the institution in its effect as a whole. To subject the average American student of 1924 to an atmosphere like this would lead to results unpleasant to contemplate. Nevertheless, it is interesting to speculate upon the effect which would be produced by even one of these changes, the abandonment of what is now the most prized feature of the college—the degree. If the student who now floats through the institution with the very minimum of effort, and who considers his course an entire success because he becomes a bachelor of arts; if such a man received nothing at all except that measure of educational advancement which came from his exertions, would he be as complacent as he now is? In other words, is not the degree a positive handicap to the college in the attainment of its intellectual purpose? Of course such speculation is merely academic: it is visionary to think of the abolition of a system so deeply grounded in our educational tradition. As long as we have degrees, we must have requirements; as long as the student is as he is, we must have rules. But for the exceptional man it seems not only desirable, but imperative, to relax rules so far as the process can be carried out; to do away with all regulations which prevent the gifted individual from improving the advantages offered him by the college to their utmost extent; and to see to it that he is given the fullest opportunity to utilize his superior abilities to the limit of his capacity. In other words, for him the spirit of the old university, so far as possible, should prevail.

Ideas like these are very prevalent among American educators of today; and the desire in colleges and universities effectively to meet the problem presented by the exceptional student is very general. The result has been the introduction of so-called honors courses in a number of institutions and serious study of their advantages in many more. It should be kept in mind that these honors courses are not at all like those in the British universities.

Neither their object nor their method is the same. In the foreign institutions, the honors course is primarily for the purpose of specialization, and while the student of the lowest grade may find some difficulty in meeting the requirements of such work, it is designed for all and not for those on the higher intellectual level. In the American college, such courses are made a method for the proper education of the exceptional student. In England, the endeavor is made to induce as many of the undergraduate body as possible to choose this work, and the attempt has succeeded so well in some institutions that the pass degree is almost extinct. With us the very purpose of the honors course makes it necessary that its application be limited to a relatively small portion of the undergraduate body; if its success becomes assured it is not believed by those who support it that at the most it could advantageously be employed by more than a quarter of the students; and by those only in the later years of the course.

Furthermore, we do not mean by honors work the system by which honors are obtained by superior excellence in the usual courses of the curriculum, or by the superimposition upon such courses of a limited amount of advanced instruction. Such processes are common, and are well enough in their way, but they have slight effect in meeting the problem as a whole. By honors courses we mean the attempt to meet the problem of the exceptional student by work of a definitely individual character especially adapted to his needs. In the process he would be removed in part or completely from the regular courses of the curriculum: and would be subject to few of the regulations by which the freedom of the ordinary student is restricted.

Fortunately, the honors course as applied in American colleges has been the subject of thorough discussion by President Aydelotte of Swarthmore in a recent bulletin (No. 40) of the National Research Council. Those who are interested in obtaining more extensive information than can be given here are referred to that report. Our discussion must be limited to the consideration of the system as applied in three or four of the institutions which were visited in this investigation.

It seems at first rather disconcerting to those who have formed high hopes of the system to find that something not essentially different from it was in operation at Michigan for a number of years, that it never was really successful, and that, when it was finally abandoned, it left so little impress on the

university that many of those now in charge of its work, until recently have not been aware that it ever existed. According to information furnished by Dean Effinger the "university system" was introduced in that institution in 1881. By its provisions, those students who wished to do so might at the beginning of their third year select three lines of study to be pursued under the direction of a committee composed of the professors having those studies in charge. Such students were subject to no further requirements for the degree beyond that of meeting satisfactorily the prescribed examinations in these subjects at the end of their course. Those who elected this method were relieved of all the ordinary restrictions of the university. In the nine years from 1882 to 1891 forty-eight students graduated under its provisions. Although it was described in the catalogue up to 1901, and seems to have been in force to that time, there is no further record that students took advantage of its opportunities. Why it was so little successful, and why it lapsed, no one seems to know, but according to Dean Effinger probably the gradual development of the free elective system was the responsible factor in the matter. So little is really known about the experiment, however, and conditions at that time were so materially different from what they now are, that not much evidence, either for or against the honors method, as an educational system can be gathered from the experiment.

In institutions which are now experimenting with the system, the range of the honors course is very great. At its lowest extreme it may consist, in a given department, merely of a two hours course of advanced nature, and of a special character, which seniors may elect. Such is the method at Knox. In its maximum development, the entire work of the last two years is in the honors course, as is true at Smith and Swarthmore. No attempt will be made to describe the application of the system in each of the institutions which in some measure or other is following the method. A few examples will be sufficient for our purpose.

Perhaps the best worked-out partial honors course is at Columbia. Here, at the end of sophomore year, a student whose average up to that time has been at least B, who is recommended by the department, and who is approved by the dean, may become a candidate for special honors. As such, his honors work is divided equally into two parts.

(1) Intensive, in a particular department, under the general

direction of that department, but conducted by an honors director who selects the field, directs the reading, and conducts conferences either with small groups or with single individuals. A comprehensive examination covering all this work is given at the end of the course.

(2) Extensive: a body of reading, alike for all honors students, no matter in what department their major work lies. This reading is definitely and minutely prescribed, and includes a list of fifty-three authors: ranging in time from Homer to William James, and in character from Plato to Moliere. Every Wednesday is held a meeting of discussion groups, composed either of three or four instructors and twenty students, or a single instructor and seven or eight. The readings which form the subject of each of these discussions are assigned in advance by a printed program, so that, when he starts the work, the student knows the subject which will be considered on each Wednesday of the two years. Twice during the semester tests of the true-false variety are imposed, by which it is made evident whether or not the reading is being properly done.

These two parts of the honors course make up two of the five subjects required of the student in each semester; the other three courses are of the ordinary variety. No special relief from general university requirements is given and, as has been seen, much of the work is rather definitely outlined. In 1923-24 something over one hundred students selected this course—about twelve per cent of the total number in the two upper classes.

At Yale a scheme is under consideration by which a student of real capactiy may, with the consent of the dean, devote six hours of his time in his third year to special work of his own choice, under direction. In this work he is subject to none of the ordinary rules of the college. If his progress is satisfactory during his junior year, he may as a senior devote all his time to the purpose. The scope of the work is to be determined by the department concerned, and careful individual attention is to be provided. At the end of the course the student must pass a searching, comprehensive examination. The plan, if adopted, is to be used in a modest way at first, but eventually it is hoped that it may extend to the upper third of the class.

At Swarthmore the system goes still farther. At the end of sophomore year students may apply for permission to take honors work. The initiative must come from the undergraduate,

although the matter may be suggested to him—or to her—from above. Much care is taken in the consideration of these requests. Their approval is based on the live interest of the student in the subject, and his general alertness, and is not alone a question of high previous record. The attempt is made to avoid the man or woman who is merely a grind: only individuals who arouse enthusiasm of the department concerned are considered good material for the honors course. When once selected, the student is no longer subject to rules of attendance, he is not required to take course tests and examinations, and in general he is put very largely on his own responsibility. The administration of the special work is in the hands of the division rather than the department, and the work embraces related fields rather than a single one. Narrow specialization is thus avoided. Weekly conferences are held, essays on assigned subjects are read at these meetings, and the discussion is general and lengthy. Sufficient time is provided so that the subject can be talked out at leisure. Usually the discussion group is made up of four or five students and as many members of the faculty. More or less guidance is given in reading, and some material—particularly in preparation for the examination—is prescribed. Attendance at regular courses is permitted, and often advised, but the honors student is subject to none of the regulations or tests of those courses. At the end of the two years, a very searching examination—and one of remarkable length—is imposed: an examination which consists of ten or twelve three hour papers together with an oral test. It was originally intended that all members of the examining board should be from outside the institution and the test should therefore apply to the work of teacher as well as to that of the student. It has worked out, however, that one Swarthmore representative has always been on each board, and the advantages of the combination have been found such that this arrangement will probably be a permanent policy. The system has not yet been applied to all divisions, but it apparently has the enthusiastic support of the faculty. Where it is used, it goes with a real zest; and the results gained are said in many cases to be equal to those required in other institutions for the master's degree. The work is done by faculty members without additional compensation. About eight per cent of the two upper classes are in the honors courses: the majority of them women.

The system at Smith is, in principle, much the same. Only students with a B average in the first two years are eligible for the honors course, and only such of these as are recommended by the department are chosen. Those selected are freed from all the ordinary restrictions of the college, but are required each semester to take two units of special work. In the last semester, however, the preparation of a thesis takes the place of one of these units. Each unit is conducted by a director who meets the students, usually in groups of not more than four, in conferences which must be held as often as once in two weeks, but which in actual practice usually are found to be necessary each week. It is thus possible for a given student to have to do in her course with seven different directors, though as a result of the continuation of work along a given line, the number is usually less than that. Students may be required by the director or by the department to attend courses of the regular type, but they are not subject to the ordinary regulations or tests of such courses. A comprehensive examination is held at the end of the work. So far about twenty to twenty-five girls have selected these courses each year; a number constituting about three per cent of the two upper classes, and about one quarter of those who are eligible to the honors work.

Enthusiasm for the honors work among the members of the Smith faculty seems not to be so general as it is at Swarthmore. Various obvious objections are raised: premature and over-specialization, a narrowing tendency due to lack of opportunity of the student to come in contact with a sufficient number of instructors, a negligible effect of the system in raising the scholastic tone of the institution as a whole. Many students qualified to elect the courses do not do so because they believe that in them they have to work much harder, and are not as likely to enjoy the advantages of "real college life." Sitting by themselves for long periods in the library, or meeting in small groups, they feel that they are becoming isolated. On the other hand, those who do engage in the work generally are enthusiastic over the system; they find the work both stimulating and interesting, and most of all they feel a real satisfaction of getting to the bottom of the problem upon which they are set rather than merely sliding over its surface. The system seems never to have been subject to the difficulty which is more or less inherent in such courses: that they become the resort of the "grind" and

are held in contempt by the rest of the college. The girls taking the honors course at Smith are, in general, those who, in other respects, are held in esteem by their companions; they are popular and influential, and as a result this core of solid work, though carried on only by a small portion of the college, is said to have been of considerable influence in raising the scholastic tone of the institution.

Such is the method of the honors course in some of the colleges in which the experiment has been made. It has been in operation too short a time to enable valid conclusions as to its effectiveness to be drawn. If we ask ourselves whether or not it is a promising solution of the pressing problem of the exceptional student, while we are hopeful of the outcome, we cannot be certain of the answer. That can only be learned by actual test.

Undergraduate enthusiasm for the system in institutions where it has not been tried, is general, but no very valuable deductions can be drawn from that enthusiasm. The ordinary student who learns of the method centers his attention on relief from restrictions, and he declines to look at anything else. On this basis his approval of the policy is one which admits of no misunderstanding. In most cases his desire for such relief is based on his desire to do nothing at all, rather than on an ambition to do a great deal more but to do more in his own way. Obviously the student who centers his attention upon relief from petty requirements, and that alone, is the one for whom such requirements are not petty, but necessary, and that man is the last who would be allowed to enjoy the benefits of the method; and the last who will desire to do so when he finds out what the method really involves.

But what of the man to whom it should apply: the man for whom the combination of increased liberty and more work of a superior grade ought really to be effective? Suppose for such men, in their last two years, we go the whole way (there seems little point in setting up the system at all unless that, or something measurably near it, is done); suppose for them we remove all the restrictions that we can; and at the same time increase greatly the individual attention devoted to them; under that system will the individual of superior capacity respond by doing more nearly than now the amount and kind of work which his intellectual capacity should enable him to do? Would a suf-

ficient number of such men respond to the invitation to go as far as their abilities warrant to make the experiment a success, or would the greater number of them be content to jog along with the crowd? No one can tell, but the chances are that the man whose mental processes have the speed of the high powered car, if he were given a chance to go by himself, would hardly be content merely to keep pace with him whose intellect works with the velocity of a cart horse. At any rate it would not be a bad idea to find out.

But suppose we do conclude that the honors system has such merits as to make it worth a trial, would it not so become the resort of the pedant and the grind that its influence would be highly deleterious rather than beneficial; would it not be, in the eyes of the men we most wish to reach, a thing, from its associations, emphatically to be avoided rather than to be embraced? That is precisely the point at which the greatest danger lies. By a careless system of admission to it it is fatally easy to cause the course to produce exactly this unfortunate effect; although if the work were properly conducted, the man whose talents are merely acquisitive would have a hard time in meeting its requirements. If the system is to have the least chance of success, it is of vital importance that the most intelligent and painstaking efforts at selection should be made. It is the testimony both at Smith and at Swarthmore that there such success has been attained, but the problem at these institutions is not the same as at a college exclusively for men. In institutions of the latter type it is not unlikely that the system will break down at this point. If it does so, it should be abandoned at once. Nevertheless, with attention at the start centered on this vital weakness, and with every effort to meet the difficulty intelligently, the chances of success are not small: they are large enough so that it seems worth while to make the attempt.

It is sometimes said that the results of such courses are after all trivial; however carefully we may set them up, they attract so small a portion of the student body as to make negligible their effect in raising the scholastic tone of the institution. This objection is easy to answer, because he who makes it has quite missed the point of the honors course. The system is not instituted primarily to raise the scholastic tone of the college: it is done rather that the obligations of the college to men

of high intellectual capacity may better be discharged. If we succeed in the latter aim, we need not concern ourselves overmuch about the former. We can at least be confident that the intellectual tone of the institution will not be impaired by the process.

The situation seems fairly simple. We do not now in the college sufficiently regard the very man who best will respond to our efforts. The honors course is a reasonable remedy for this weakness. There may be other solutions which are better, but if they exist, they have not yet made their virtues apparent. It is obvious that many obstacles stand in the way of the application of the method, obstacles which are unquestionably serious, but which do not seem to be insuperable. Why, therefore, should we not give the method fair trial? If it succeeds, well and good; if it fails, we are no worse off than before. We commit ourselves to nothing that cannot be applied without serious modification of our present system, and cannot be abandoned without shock to the institution. The chances of success seem reasonably good. If that success is attained we have solved a pressing difficulty; if it is not, we must find some other method which is a real solution. For one thing is certain—the assertion that the American college treats men of high mental calibre by methods which are both wasteful and ineffective is an assertion which is true. If the institution is to maintain its self respect, it must set itself to find a remedy for the situation.

Chapter XXXII

THE TEACHER

OUR consideration of methods and processes of education in the college is well enough in itself, its importance is not to be gainsaid, but after all it is far from satisfactory if it is limited to those elements of the situation which have already been discussed. As a matter of fact the success or failure of the college depends, more than upon all others combined, upon a single factor: the nature of the teaching. A good teacher can hardly fail of some degree of effectiveness no matter how imperfect the method may be; and a thoroughly bad one will fail of success even if the methods used are in all ways satisfactory. So we cannot conclude our discussion without an attempt to consider a few phases of the problem of the teacher, although space will not permit a thorough consideration of the question as a whole.

In some ways it is unfortunate that this element of the situation cannot be disregarded. For one who has been for some years a college teacher—and who would like to remain one for some years to come—to discuss the shortcomings of the group to which he belongs is a somewhat delicate matter; even though such discussion is general in its nature, and without intention of specific application. Therefore, not to affect the force of the *tu quoque* form of retort, but to forestall it, the writer is quite ready to admit that he has his full share of the faults here presented, and probably many others not mentioned. The edge of the argument of those who may differ with him having thus been slightly blunted, let us proceed to the consideration of the status of teaching in the American colleges at the present day.

The teacher in the early colleges is sometimes held to have been the superior of his later successor. There is little reason to believe that this opinion is justified. It is true that he enjoyed the opportunity of intimate personal contact with his students: an advantage which was partially neutralized by his rather undue sense of personal dignity, by his high hat and his formal manners. Moreover the tendency to conduct class room exercises in a cut-and-dried way was such as materially

to detract from the effectiveness even of the most competent instructor. Nor does it seem to have been necessary for him to be deeply versed in the subject which was supposed to be his specialty. Scholars there were in those days—more of them perhaps than we sometimes think—but it was nevertheless true that deep learning was regarded as a happy accident, rather than a prime necessity.

In fact when one compares the college teacher of today with his predecessor of a period no more remote than thirty years, the difference in the general nature of the faculty is most striking. Already the tendency which was to lead to conditions as we now know them was well under way, and the younger teachers were much as they now are. But among the older ones—men whose original appointments dated from a period now sixty or seventy years past—while there was the usual dead level of mediocrity, two outstanding varieties sharply emerged from the general mass. On the one hand, was the man of absolute incompetence: the man who neither knew much of his subject, nor had acquired in his thirty or more years of experience any reasonable idea at all of the way it should be presented: and who, furthermore, had no marked gifts of personality which should influence favorably the students under his charge. Why these men—and they were not few—were ever engaged, was always a subject of profound interest and animated debate among the undergraduates. The conclusion usually was that the use of personal influence had been brought to bear on the trustees; but what could have been the nature of the influence which should produce such results was hard to fathom. There was no question, however, of the security of tenure of these men, or of their continuous ineffectiveness in their long term of service. It seems quite sure that, with all the criticism of the modern teacher, he never descends to such abysmal depths as this. On the other hand, in refreshing contrast, was the type of man to which the graduate of those days looks back upon with respect, and often with affection, as the source of whatever intellectual inspiration he may have derived from his college experience. These teachers were competent in their knowledge of their individual subjects, although often they were not so deeply learned in narrow branches of it as the modern teacher is likely to be. But they were men preeminently distinguished by a broad grasp, not only of their fields, but of others; and,

as much as one man can be, of the field of knowledge as a whole. So, in their instruction, they made the subject in which they were engaged the center from which radiated lines into the whole range of human interest; they set forth the material of their specialty, not only for its own sake, but as the starting point of a broad and interesting discussion of many things; their purpose was primarily to educate rather than to train; and the contagion of their personal example as broad, intellectually curious gentlemen was a contagion the effect of which was felt by all. The modern specialist would term them superficial; and perhaps, in a sense, they were; but despite their superficiality the example which they afforded had an effectiveness which the narrow intensity of the modern specialist frequently fails to attain. Perhaps such teachers are still to be found in our colleges, but the tendencies of the times are against them: the measuring scale which now is applied to the teacher is such as to place them at a disadvantage. It is in the possession of such men, if at all, that we concede a degree of superiority to the college of former days.

The change in the general character of the college teacher, a change already to be observed in the younger college instructors which we describe, is one due to the introduction of better facilities for advanced training; and the demand on the part of those who select teachers that these opportunities be utilized. The graduate departments of our universities are, in essence, professional schools for the training of college and university teachers; and he who is desirous of an academic career finds it difficult, if not impossible, to make progress if he does not prepare himself for such service by long study in these institutions. The advanced degree is now the key indispensable for entrance to the ranks of the profession. Such requirements have led to the happy result that the general level of attainment among college teachers is far higher than it was in the days when graduate training was relatively limited; and it is seldom true in these days that student criticism of a college teacher—active as it is—is directed toward incompetence in his grasp of the subject. It is a complaint common enough, more common perhaps than it used to be, that a man cannot teach; it is a very rare criticism that he does not know.

But despite the opportunities for more thorough preparation, and despite the fact that seldom is there lack of abundant

candidates for any college vacancy, it is the unanimous and evidently heart-felt testimony of university presidents that the greatest problem of their position is to secure teachers of competence—to say nothing of those who are of marked excellence. Most presidents are frank to admit that their best efforts in this direction fail to gain the desired success, nor do they believe a large degree of success possible so long as conditions remain as they now are. One president expressed himself as utterly discouraged by the "anaemic" character of the product of the graduate schools, and another administrative officer considered that the chief difficulty of the college comes from the preponderance of "mud turtles" on the faculty. Picturesque language of this kind is not to be taken with entire seriousness, but it is none the less true that, as a class, those who are preparing themselves for the work of college teaching do not present, as much as could be desired, those characteristics of personality and breadth of viewpoint which are indispensable if a large measure of success is to be attained. We need to ask ourselves therefore why this condition is true; what are the drawbacks to the academic career, which appear to make relatively slight its appeal to men of the type which we desire.

Unquestionably one reason for this situation is the decline of prestige of the college professor in the eyes of the community. The process which for years has applied to the clergy is also at work with the college teacher, although it has by no means gone so far. With the public at large the term "professor" as applied to an individual is in itself an argument against any principle which he advances unless the discussion be one in which his specialty is directly involved. One of the very few attempts which the writer has made to express publicly his views on questions other than scientific, called forth an amusingly heated rejoinder which started thus, "The writer of this communication is described as a college professor. That explains much." It was generally conceded by those who read that this point was a very telling one. When, by some miraculous chance, a former college teacher secured the presidential nomination, the national organization of one of the opposing parties sedulously endeavored to capitalize the disadvantages of his former calling by referring to him as "Professor" on every possible occasion.

When this feeling is analyzed, the basis of it is usually found in the belief that the college teacher is a mere theorist, and is

utterly impractical when he has to do with the actual administration of affairs of importance. Of course, as a matter of fact, college teachers as a class, in this, as in other respects, are about like the rest of the world: there are those among them who are highly impractical, and there are those who are the opposite. During the war, when the college professor was brought into close contact with the supposed efficiency of the American man of business, he had no particular difficulty in meeting the requirements of the situation to the satisfaction of all concerned. In fact he was so little impressed by his contacts with the self sufficiency of the business world that upon the conclusion of his work and his return to the academic shades, he had much to say, with convincing illustrations, of the real deficiency in practical sense of the "go-getter." As a matter of fact, from his relative seclusion, the college teacher in some ways is in a position of decided advantage in the survey of problems from a detached point of view. In his case the weight of personal interest—because his personal advantage is in no way affected by the matter—is less likely to have a preponderating influence in the decision. The result is that his conclusion is frequently in opposition to the desires of individuals and groups whose main interest in the question comes from its effect on their own advantage, and whose judgments as to public policies, as is natural with human beings, are largely based on considerations of private gain. To such a group, much impressed with the validity of their case, and perhaps quite honestly unaware of the real reason for the strength of their convictions, the opinion of the college teacher is not pleasing; they pronounce it unimportant because it is based on theoretical reasoning rather than practical judgment—but really because it does not take particularly into consideration the personal advantage of the individuals concerned. A detached and independent attitude is generally not a popular one, and the brand of impracticality is easy to affix to the teacher and difficult to remove.

The lack of logic in the situation has an aspect which is almost humorous. Colleges are overthronged with students, the value of college training is recognized by the greater portion of the public, though oftentimes with little understanding of why it is valuable; glib speakers and fluent writers descant on the nobility of the calling of the teacher; upon his responsibility

for the moulding of the race; and expatiate upon the idea that the future safety of the state depends on the wider extension of education. At the same time those who must carry out this mighty and responsible task are not regarded with the seriousness with which persons subject to such weighty responsibilities might well consider their due. This may be one of the reasons why the calling of the college teacher has not the attractiveness which brings into its ranks a satisfying number of men of the right type.

If the teachers themselves are asked the reason for the relative failure of the profession to gain desirable recruits, their answer, in general, is simple, clear and definite: that the financial rewards are not sufficient. It must be confessed that this is the most important element of the situation. The expense of preparation for an academic career is large: the demands of the position itself require that a certain standard be maintained. The college professor with a wife and family, if he relies on his salary alone, can just about make income keep pace with expenditure; and that only at the sacrifice of many things which are highly desirable; and which in the past have been regarded as necessary. There is little chance for saving; while proper protection for old age, and the accidents of life, are provided only with the utmost difficulty. The collapse of hope of material aid from the Carnegie Foundation is likely to make the problem in the future one of even greater difficulty. It is true that governing boards are alive to the situation, and have made strenuous efforts to improve the financial status of the calling, but their efforts, in most cases, have not done more than to keep pace with the rising cost of living, if they have done that. In fact, it is doubtful if college teachers of 1924 are, as a class, in a condition so financially satisfactory as were their predecessors of 1860, despite the seemingly meagre salaries of those days. If tendencies continue in the direction to which they now point, one is almost led to believe that, in the future, no one will be able to take up the work of college teaching unless he is possessed of independent means, or unless he is content to lead a celibate—or at any rate, a childless—existence. Such a limitation would not seem to be one which would work for the effectiveness of the college.

It is often said that even under these circumstances the average earnings of college teachers are fully equal to those of

professional men in general. That statement may or may not be true; it is very difficult to obtain reliable information upon which a definite conclusion may be based. But whether it is so or not, it makes very little difference in its effect upon the attractiveness of the calling to men of the right kind. Those who are looking toward a life work—so far as financial inducements influence them at all—are likely to pay little attention to average earnings—they are more apt to consider primarily the top of the scale. They know well enough that the chances are against their reaching that level; but they also feel that the opportunity is there. Teaching offers none of these high rewards; he who selects such a career has no dazzling financial vision before him; he knows that his work can at the best bring him little more than a life of reasonable comfort, and it may not bring that. In particular, in these days, when the choice is not so much between other professions and teaching, as between business and teaching, and at a time when money-making is frankly a prime object of the college graduate—not so much because he is attracted by the glamour of wealth, as because he realizes that the effectiveness of an individual in his contacts with the world is much enhanced if he has the independence which financial prosperity can bring—that choice is usually not a difficult one to make. Any college teacher who endeavors to influence toward an academic career the student whom he is sure gives promise of marked success, knows how difficult it is to overcome the financial handicap, and how seldom success rewards his efforts.

There are many features in the life of the college teacher which are attractive. It is pleasant; associates are congenial, there is a considerable degree of independence, associations with the student body are generally enjoyable. It is commonly regarded as an easy life; but at the start, at any rate, such a conception is hardly justified. The individual who does not work at that point usually after a little has no chance to work—at that institution. It is true that when success is attained, and the highest rung of the ladder is reached, a man does have the opportunity to loaf if he wishes; and nobody seems to be able to prevent him from doing so. The tendency of the older men to "ossify," as one college president puts it, is one of the problems of the college; but it is not a problem which concerns many men. Natural ambition keeps most of them active. But

although work is not lacking, much of it is attractive, and the man who is doing it, is doing what he most wants to do. These attractions so influence men that there is seldom any lack of candidates for college positions. But through the effect of the financial disadvantages, these candidates are likely to be divided into two classes: men of financial independence, and those whose natural ambitions are limited, who never aspire to more than reasonable comfort in life, whose imaginations have never soared to any lofty heights. Of those of the first class nothing in particular need be said: they may be good or bad or anywhere between. The second class, by far the larger, is more definite in its general characteristics. Lack of ambition in the financial sense may not involve lack of other kinds of ambition, and we have many men of this kind who make the most inspiring of teachers. But in general there is the tendency for men who lack this kind of ambition to do so because they lack personality; they have not their proper share of self assertion; in them industry is developed at the expense of imagination, and they find their greatest satisfaction in tasks laboriously petty and ingeniously trivial; but they lack zest, and imagination and fire. Even such men, under the force of necessity, may develop into satisfactory teachers, but they may not. The explanation of the "anaemic" character of the product of the graduate school is likely to be at this point. The wonder is, with these disadvantages in the background, that so many men of competence, rather than so few, are found among them.

The Work of the College Teacher

If we assume the individual has entered upon his work as a member of a college faculty: what is he to do? In particular, what line must he follow in order that his success may be marked? Obviously the inference would seem to be that, if he is a teacher, he must teach; that his success in arousing the interest of his students, his skill in so handling the work of the class that the desired results are accomplished, is made the measure of his capacity. But to teach one must know. In the old college neither of these requirements seems to have been tested in a satisfactory way. There were in them some faculty members who neither knew nor could teach, there were many who knew enough and could teach sufficiently well so that their efforts

were not notorious; there were some who could teach wonderfully well and knew enough of many things to make that teaching supremely effective. But of scholars in the technical sense there were few. It is in general a fair criticism of the faculty of the old college to say that its members did not know enough.

After the middle of the last century this situation changed. American students began more and more to attend the German universities and to bring back with them the guiding principles of those institutions. As time went on the institutions themselves were copied, and in most cases superimposed upon the college as a graduate school, without much regard as to whether or not the relationship would fit. As the product of such schools brought with them a certain guarantee of knowledge, the colleges turned to them for recruits of the instructing staff. Eventually, as has been said, these schools became practically the only pathway to academic positions. They have acted so effectively that the college teacher, their product, is no longer justly subject to criticism that he does not know: a result highly desirable to have attained.

But with all this advantage has developed a situation which, to use no stronger terms, seems by no means desirable. To know, according to the modern theory, one must delve deeply in the field of knowledge: so deeply, in fact, as to go farther than anyone else has gone; one does not really know until he has gone beyond the frontier; one does not grasp fully the relationships of his subject unless he is actively at work in enlarging its boundaries. But to teach one must know. So by a logical process we have the proposition that no man can teach effectively who is not actively at work in investigation. We come to the idea of research for the college teacher; not as a qualification which is merely desirable, but as one which is positively necessary. This idea may now be said to be the guiding theory in the larger number of our institutions: an idea which has so contorted the position of investigation in the eyes of the college teacher that it has become almost a hampering fetish rather than a high ideal. Let us see how it works.

In the undergraduate departments of our universities, teaching ability and skill in investigation are both stated as absolutely necessary qualities which the faculty member must possess. Most presidents assert that the first is as necessary as the second.

In practice that is far from the case. Investigation is capable of direct measurement; published papers are definite and tangible; they can be sent broadcast with the name of the university on the front page; they have advertising value. Teaching cannot be estimated so readily, and has little immediate reaction on the outside world. You cannot sum it up in tabular form in the president's report, but you *can* list therein all the articles which have been contributed by each member of the faculty, with the number of pages of each, and you can, after a fashion, measure the productivity of the individual with no more complicated instrument than a foot rule. Many of these published articles are worth while, and bring deserved repute to their authors; many of them are trivial, and count only as so many pages of published matter to be counted as so many pages in favor of those who wrote them. Promotions depend in some institutions almost absolutely on such "productive work," and he who by it reaches the highest levels in the university, both in pay and in rank, is likely to value much that which placed him there, and relatively little that which did not much count. So he becomes reluctant to have to do with the most difficult task in his department—the teaching of elementary students. Or if he does do such teaching, he limits himself to formal lectures and intrusts the real personal contact with the student—the method by which teaching is most effective—to relatively untrained assistants. He is even likely to be contemptuous of elementary teaching, although intolerantly critical of those who are doing the work: he adopts the attitude that teaching is "boys' work" while research is a "man's job."

Under this sytem it does not take long for the man just entering upon his work as a teacher to find the proper road for advancement. He knows that he will not get ahead if he is an utterly ineffective teacher and so he rises a bit above that point. He knows that high skill in the art will get him very little. But he knows that he can get ahead, where he is or elsewhere, if he publishes material generous in quantity and fair in quality; and so he sets himself at that task, not necessarily because he wants to do it, but because he must get ahead. Obviously his teaching is a secondary interest, and obviously it suffers. On the other hand, there are men who, against their own self interest, refuse to follow that process. Their hearts are in teaching; it is the one thing they wish to do. Instead of devoting themselves to Research with a large R they modestly content themselves with

study—with a small s: study, some of which has to do with effective presentation of material to their classes and of the organization of instruction. Of course if the principles upon which the institution works are valid, these men should not be allowed to teach at all; they are not investigating, therefore they do not know; if they do not know, they cannot teach. But that is far from the method followed. They are given all the teaching they can do, and that of the most important kind. They lay the foundation of the work upon which their more eminent colleagues are to build; they give men who are not to carry further the work of the department the only ideas of the subject which they are to carry into the world, and they do it well. But their success is rewarded by the very smallest pay which will keep them in the institution; they are subject to no call from other colleges because their reputation is merely local and of the wrong kind; and promotion, if it comes, is slow and grudging, and usually against the wishes of their more successful colleagues, who protest that such individuals "have never done anything."

The system as it is described, prevails with little modification in some American universities. It is more or less the general tendency of most of them. In a few a marked reaction against it has taken place. In the graduate school the spirit of research cannot too much be stressed. But the college of liberal arts is not a graduate school; its primary purpose is not the development of scholarship in the technical sense, but the arousing of the intellectual interests of men whose subsequent courses will be in varied walks of life. In the training of such men much of the work must be of an elementary nature, and all of it must be designed for the purpose of affording an extensive general grasp of the subjects studied, and not an intensive investigation of narrow portions of them. To gain this end the work of the teacher is essential: the skilled teacher whose leading interest is his profession. To make the main test by which teaching success is estimated something essentially unrelated to teaching ability, is unfair to the student as well as to the instructor, and is ineffective in its results. The college of liberal arts rises or falls by the ability of its teachers, and if the teacher is to be judged by a test unfair in its purpose and in its application, the institution will tend to fall—as far as its main object goes—rather than to rise.

But if this be granted what becomes of the principle upon which American university education is based: that no man can

really be a good teacher unless he is engaged on investigation; unless he is making a part of the knowledge which he teaches? The answer is that the principle is not true. It is one of those owl-like sayings which has been reiterated so often that it is accepted as truth merely from the force of repetition. By the majority of teachers, it is held with more tenacity perhaps than any other single principle, and he who disputes it is regarded as outside the true academic pale. But none the less it is a false principle, and examples to prove that it is untrue can be found in every institution in the land. Many members of our faculties there are who lack the taste for investigation in the technical sense; many of them are the best teachers we have. It is common to pick flaws in the work of such men, and as a result to pronounce them ineffective. But upon examination of these flaws, they are usually found upon analysis to reduce themselves to the fact that such men do not engage in research. In other words they cannot be good teachers because, if they are, the dogma described above is not true. Such a method of argument is frequently used against them: a conclusion arrived at to support a theory and not a conclusion based on fact. But after all they are good teachers, and everyone knows it save those interested in maintaining the primacy of research in the work of the college faculty. Enough of them can be found in every institution to make perfectly clear the absurdity of the principle which has so long prevailed.

As a matter of fact, teachers in college faculties may be classified about like this:

I. Men who can teach well, but are not effective in research. Such individuals should be kept at the work of teaching, and if their success is marked, they should receive from it exactly the same rewards as those gained by their colleagues who are primarily investigators.

II. Men who do both teaching and research passably well. Such men, as much as possible, should be given opportunities to develop according to their own preferences. They presumably will interest themselves in both fields of activity, but should be under no pressure to regard one as on a higher plane than the other.

III. Men who are competent investigators, but who cannot teach, or who do not want to teach, or who look upon teaching with disdain. Such men should be given full opportunities for

research, but should not be allowed to teach except in advanced courses covering their own special field. They should have little or nothing to say about the conduct of the elementary instruction which they themselves are incompetent or unwilling to carry on.

IV. Men who are at the same time brilliant investigators and enthusiastic teachers. Such men are the real stars of the academic firmament, and should be allowed to do exactly as they like.

There are many who will criticise such a division, and who will criticise it from varied points of view. In the first place we have the group of extremists: the men who have in the past been in complete control of our universities, and are still very largely in that position. Their reverence for anything however trivial that may be labeled research is extreme, and their contempt for teaching as such is equally so. They are likely to say that those who make the plea for better teaching, and a larger respect for its value to the college, do so because they are unable to engage successfully in the work of research and take refuge in talk of teaching from motives of self interest. Of this class was a former university president, who greeted his faculty upon his assumption of office with the advice that they show their reprints if they wished to get ahead. It is such men who give to the noble idea of investigation the pompous pretentiousness which it sometimes holds; they have for it an ostentatious reverence oftentimes quite out of proportion to the nature of the thing revered. As a reaction from this tendency there rises in some men, themselves successful investigators, an abhorrence of the very name research; they prefer to call it study; and it is really amazing how the bubble of pretentiousness is pricked by the simple change of name. There are others who would regard teaching itself as a form of research: which it is, if well and conscientiously done.

More reasonable are the group who place high the value of teaching, but who consider that teaching ability involves the necessity of keeping in close touch with the subject taught: of being conversant with its advance. This very process involves progress along the frontiers of knowledge; and no man can do that without at times hitting upon things that are new; things that are well worth bringing to the attention of other workers in the field. There is nothing in this conception which can be criticised; the spirit which should animate the college teacher can hardly be better stated. The only danger is that implications will be drawn from the theory which lead to undesirable results.

If the perfectly correct idea that publication from time to time is natural, is pushed to the point of regarding it as necessary; and the term "from time to time" is considered to mean "all the time" then we are back where we were before with all the unfortunate results to which that process leads. While such an outcome is not all in the minds of those who hold this belief, it is an outcome which is very likely to be reached.

Of course, the problem presented by the man who stagnates is always present in the college. It is a difficult one to solve, and it cannot be said that it is solved with success by any system. It is true that as teaching capacity is not subject to direct measurement and as productivity is, there is perhaps less difficulty in determining directly who is lazy and who is not under a system which places the largest emphasis upon publication. But it is very doubtful if in most cases the investigations conducted by an inert individual under the pressure of necessity are of much value. In any case, it seems evident that less harm is done to the college of liberal arts by the system which may permit the indolent faculty member to carry his indolence rather farther than he ought, than by one by which the teacher is conscious that success depends upon something besides ability to teach.

It is sometimes said that of all things college students should be subject to the influence of high scholarship; that eminence in a chosen field is the best recommendation to attention that a teacher can have; and the one which gives him that prestige which makes his work most effective. There are elements of truth in this idea, and it certainly works in the case of the man of eminence who is also an individual of personal magnetism and charm: one who enjoys the work of teaching and is not contemptuous even of elementary instruction. But it is often applied to him whose eminence comes from his exclusive devotion to a narrow range of investigation, and who, from the very intentness of that interest is less concerned than he might be with things outside it. The appeal of such teachers to the mass of the student body is usually far from effective. The average student is likely to look upon them much as the small boy at his first circus regards the camel: with some degree of awe; with full appreciation of his various excellencies; but with not the slightest desire to be a camel. Men of the narrowly scholarly type are effective in the training of students whose interest in their specialty has already been aroused; they are likely to be ineffective in appeal to the mass.

If the college of liberal arts is to accomplish its purpose it would seem necessary that it should organize its instruction on the following basis:

I. Above all things it should see that its teaching is real and inspiring. To accomplish this it should make plain that the rewards of the successful teacher are as great as any which the institution affords.

II. So far as its resources permit, it should provide for every teacher who wishes to engage in research facilities for doing so, and time to make the investigation effective. It should offer every encouragement for its men to do work of this kind, but that encouragement should not be pushed to the point of direct pressure. It should place the rewards of respectable competence in investigation on the same plane as effectiveness in teaching. But it should not impose upon students poor teaching because the individual in question is successful in investigation, nor should it hamper the work of the really good teacher with demands for definite and regular productivity in research which he has no wish to undertake.

III. It should provide for the instruction of students well advanced in their work, and for those who are looking toward a career of technical scholarship, men who are competent for that kind of instruction: men who themselves are specialists in their subject, who are active in increasing its boundaries, and who are expected to devote most of their efforts to that purpose. But these individuals should be active at the point at which their activity is most fruitful, and should not be forced into the work of elementary instruction if they do not wish to do it, or if they do not do it well. Nor should their position be such as to give them undue dominance either in the general policies of the institution, or in the management of their particular departments.

Of course it is not intended that there should be the sharp division of functions which this outline may seem to indicate. There will be much overlapping to suit the individual tastes of men, and to suit the needs of the particular college. But as a guiding principle, the application of which is to be varied with conditions, such a scheme does not seem to be unreasonable.

It will at once be said that the purpose of this discussion is to decry research and to minimize the essential importance of the process of extending the field of human knowledge. It will not only be said, but it will be said with considerable vehemence and

with a measure of contempt. There is no heresy in American education today which is considered more deadly, and which is repelled with more intolerance than the opinions which have been stated above. Of course such an object is not the one in mind. No one who gives thought to the matter is likely to be unenthusiastic as to the importance of investigation, or to wish to limit its field. Criticism of research in the college is not criticism of research itself; but of the fact that too much of it is done with an ulterior purpose: with a spirit which is not the spirit of the true investigator. Research carried out because the individual who is doing it is animated by the desire to know, and is irresistibly impelled to find out, is sure to be fruitful; it is a type of which we need as much as we can get. Research carried out primarily because the individual desires to be a college teacher, or, if one, to advance his status in his calling, is likely to be trivial and ineffective. We have that kind in abundance now, and an inspection of doctor's theses and technical journals is sufficient proof of the fact. Whatever may be our opinion as to that, it is a fact that the college of liberal arts is an institution with a perfectly definite purpose—that of arousing the intellectual curiosity of the youths under its charge. To accomplish that purpose is a difficult task, and one in which the utmost skill of the teacher must be employed. To impose on such teachers requirements based on theories which, however good they may be in themselves, stand in no direct relation to the problem of the college, is to impose handicaps on the institution which materially detract from its efficiency. That seems to be exactly what has been done in the past; and, although a reaction from the extreme position is under way, it is still what is being done in many of our colleges. Research as a natural outgrowth of the work of the teacher, encouraged and allowed to develop in the natural way, that is well and good; research as the prime test of the teacher, as the indispensable and all important requirement for advancement in the undergraduate college, that is a principle thoroughly bad in theory, and ineffective in practice.

* * * *

From the tendencies of modern education have developed other factors which serve to make the purpose of the college less easily attained than otherwise it might be. We are agreed that it is the function of the institution to graduate men whose

intellectual interests have been aroused, and aroused in broad fields: men who have gained in college an incentive which will be an asset to them through life. To accomplish this purpose we institute elaborate systems of distribution, systems by which we bndeavor to bring the student into contact with as many fields of knowledge as seem reasonable, on the principle that he become eroadly interested and informed thereby. While we do this carefully enough, we are apt to neglect the most broadening influence of all: that of the really intelligent teacher.

As a corollary to the vast increase of information comes the necessity of division; and as knowledge grows more and more extensive, subdivision becomes more minute. So we have the splitting of the general fields into smaller ones; each with its workers intensely cultivating it; and as the process goes on the individual fields grow ever smaller and the cultivation more intense. We have our departmental systems; soon they no longer do and we must set up sub-divisions of departments, ever growing more numerous. Such arrangements are necessary in the evolutionary process of the college, and the teacher, to be effective at all, must make his main efforts center within a narrow range. In that field he must know.

While this process is inevitable it may lead to results which are disastrous to the college. It is no easy process to become learned in a narrow field, and in the training necessary to achieve that end the individual frequently loses sight of all else. Not only does he lose sight of all else but he may even gain the idea that there is little else of importance; his vision becomes so utterly distorted that all sense of perspective is lost. Such a man as a teacher, with sincere enthusiasm but with mistaken emphasis, so magnifies the importance of the realm of his interests as to give a misleading impression to all those who listen to his voice. At his best he ignores other branches of knowledge than his own; at his worst he is openly contemptuous of them. Such men may teach their subjects well, but do they not miss a vital point?

After all, is not the main purpose of liberal education the establishment in the mind of him who studies a proper *sense of the relationship* of the branches of knowledge, and the *unity* of knowledge as a whole? We recognize the validity of the theory and we go to much trouble, by comprehensive courses, in some measure to attain that end. Such courses are well enough in their way. But how much more effective would be a college

every instructor of which was animated with the guiding principle that his own subject—important as it is and thoroughly as it is to be taught—serves as a center from which radiates filaments into every other; and that it should be his conscious and primary purpose so to stress its bearings that it will not appear to be an isolated unit but a part of a great whole. Should not the teacher of chemistry center much of his efforts on the relation of his subject to all branches of knowledge; should he refrain from references to Hannibal, the Alps, and vinegar because that is ancient history; the remarkable effects of the discovery of the cyanide process for the extraction of gold upon recent American history because that is political science and economics, the bearings of the application of the safety lamp because that is sociology, the discussion of the methods of the scientist in arriving at theoretical results because that is philosophy. Is there any branch of learning which does not lead to every other? If a college were conducted on this basis would not these filaments thrown out by each department into the relams of the others so knit and twine themselves together in the mind of the student as to give him more than at present a true sense of what the knowledge really is, and how unified, after all, are its manifestations.

Of course, the process must be skillfully done. It is fatally easy, for one who bases his conception of the functions of the teacher upon this principle to arrive at a weak and diffuse result, quite useless to all concerned. It is equally easy to form hobbies which, like Mr. Dick's head of Charles the First, intrude themselves on all occasions, and opportunities for which are continually made available by the student body, who soon keenly grasp its implications and draw forth lengthy comment whenever they feel the desire for a needed rest. Such pitfalls must be warily avoided; the subject taught must, of course, be the center of instruction, and there must be no slackening in its requirements; but all things outside need not be shut out with rigid bars. Nor does the process involve remarkable learning; a range of information attained only by the superman. It requires only in the teacher that intellectual interest which is our goal for the student himself. It is not possible for the normal man, be he college teacher or not, to be deeply learned in many subjects, but he can know well the relationships of the branches of knowledge, and he can know enough of many of them to make his discussion of those relationships effective. His teaching will not suffer thereby, either in intensity, or depth, or interest.

It is a fact that, at present, students are likely to gain from their college course an idea that the realm of knowledge is divided by impenetrable partitions into fields bearing definite labels, and each without connection with the other. The sense of relationship is developed in slight degree or not at all. In such cases no one can say that the purpose of the college has been attained. But attainment of that purpose may be reached by a process relatively simple. The ideals of broad knowledge and of live intellectual interest, like those of character—and unlike those of technical scholarship—are highly contagious. If the instructor shows those traits, the student is likely to follow. We state as the purpose of the college the development of an intellectual curiosity which will lead the product of the institution by the interest which has been aroused in him into many fields. How better can it be developed than to place before him a body of teachers in whom he recognizes that those results have been attained.

Quite in agreement with the tendencies noted above is another which is not helpful to the college in its work. It is sometimes said that the college teacher is not interested in education as such: that the only people connected with the institutions who really are so interested are the administrative officers, who, from their position, are required to be. The statement in that form is an exaggeration, but it has in it elements of truth. Too many college teachers are not really interested in the vital problems of the college. Each is keenly interested in his own department, and in the best methods to be used in its work—in particular he is interested in the training of specialists therein. His live interest, when matters of curriculum are considered, is to see that his department shall not suffer. We go largely on the absurd principle that an effective unified college can be built by the maximum development of individual departments, each proceeding on its way without much regard to another.

It is doubtful if a really effective college of liberal arts can be produced in that way. It is doubtful if a college can attain its purpose of broad intellectual training unless, first, the individual members of the faculty are convinced that such is the proper purpose and are seriously interested in seeing that in their own work it is properly met; and, second, that real team play is brought to bear on the problem. It is not apparent in most of our colleges that either of these conditions is present to the extent that might

be desired. In particular, discussions relating to the purpose of education are neither common, nor when undertaken are particularly fruitful. One former college president is quoted as having said that no institution is really alive in which acrimonious discussion is not going on. It is doubtful if acrimony ever got anyone anywhere except to a place he did not want to go; but discussion is always valuable, even if it leads to no immediate result. We have committees of instruction and the like, groups which are extremely active at times and which then relapse—to the relief of the rest of the faculty—to the consideration of trivial details, the settlement of which makes little difference to anyone. Is it not necessary that some definite provision should be made for bringing to a focus the varied ideas among the teaching body which otherwise would have no definite influence? In some institutions efforts in that direction are being made. At Brown an Academic Council has been organized; a body which has as its purpose merely the survey of the general situation in the institution and the suggestion of measures for betterment. These suggestions go to the regular committees for detailed consideration. The Council consists of the President, Deans, Librarian, representatives from five important committees, and five members at large; and is required to meet once a month. As it has recently been organized it has not yet had an opportunity to show its efficiency.

Whatever the machinery involved, discussions of the general purposes of the institution and of how best such purposes may be carried out, should certainly be more common and more active than they now are. Nor should they be sporadic. The young instructor, in particular, should be given more of an opportunity than he now has to learn the reasons of academic policy; to contribute what he can to the general store; and most of all to feel himself a real and active part of the college organization. No institution can hope to do its best work without the active participation in its policies of all its teaching force. Such participation in the college is not in all cases easy to secure, but every effort should at least be made to obtain, if possible, a machine in which all concerned should be inspired by a common purpose and a common interest.

Other factors of the teacher's work might be considered, but the discussion is already too long. To sum it up; we seem to require a better class of candidates for positions in college faculties.

To obtain that result we must have a different attitude toward the profession on the part of the public, and a scale of compensation more in keeping with the requirements of the position. We must have increased emphasis on the importance of the work of the teacher as such, and must assure the man of teaching ability that such ability will receive its due reward. We must give ample opportunity for investigation, and encouragement to those who wish to carry it on; but success in research must not be the sole test of teaching efficiency. College professors must be men of broad general interests; they must have as an ideal of their teaching the establishment of the relation of specialized knowledge of their subjects to knowledge as a whole. They should be men genuinely interested in education, and not exclusively wrapped up in specialized training.

These are truly modest demands. It has been the endeavor in this report not to soar into the realm of impossibilities; not to advocate, on the basis of preconceived theory, improvements impractical to obtain. It is feared that marked deviations from this principle are to be found at this point. But perhaps it does no harm to state what seems desirable, to provoke discussion with those who consider the principles and methods here advocated not as desirable but as positively fatal; and, if possible, to come to some clear conception of what the college teacher should really be and really do. If we can arrive at some measure of agreement on that, at least the way has been cleared for progress to begin.

Chapter XXXIII

THE TRAINING OF THE TEACHER

The Graduate School

NO discussion of the work of the teacher can be satisfactory without some reference to the method by which he is trained. As we have seen, that method, in the form of the graduate school, is now well worked out and standardized, so that the man who looks forward to college teaching knows exactly what he must do to prepare himself for that career. The results of such training, so far as they have to do with the definite mastery of his subject required of the would-be teacher, are eminently satisfactory. Unfortunately mastery of subject matter, important as it is, is not enough.

In our consideration of the graduate school we at once encounter a confusion of purpose. A primary object of the university is the extension of human knowledge, and much emphasis is laid upon the obligation of the institution to the community ever to devote its efforts to this most important of all ends. No objection can be raised to this idea itself; nor would anyone wish to minimize its importance. The graduate school serves as the center of the research activities of the institution, and while investigation is by no means excluded from other branches of the university, it is not their most important function. But if the graduate school makes investigation its primary purpose it would seem to be the all sufficient one; a problem would be entered upon in order that it might be solved, and when that result was reached the end desired would be attained. In other words, results, the solution of problems, would be all that would count. He who surveys the graduate school knows that this is not at all its method, nor is its purpose such in the minds of its students. The institution is active in the work of teaching; like the college it grants degrees, and so must set up standards and requirements which must be met before these degrees can be obtained. Like the college, too, the degree becomes the object which draws the student to the institution: one justly important because through it alone

entrance may be gained to the calling which he desires to make his own. So while the idea of extension of knowledge is not abandoned, but is made a means to the desired end, and while other callings are open to the holder of the doctorate, as the process actually has developed, the graduate school is utilized mainly for the training of college teachers, and as such occupies a place much the same as other schools for the training of professional men.

If this purpose be admitted, a consideration of the methods of the institution becomes a necessary part of a discussing of the problems of the college. Does it do its work so well that the college can rest content with the training which its teachers there receive? In one respect at any rate there is no room for complaint. The institution has been thoroughly effective in raising the scholastic tone of those who pass through its doors; its degree is a guarantee that he who has received it has a knowledge of his subject which is both thorough and deep. No one would wish to change the situation in a way to make this guarantee less effective. But while we admit the tremendous importance of this part of the equipment of the teacher, while we judge it to be indispensable, it is none the less true that it is not the only factor which must be stressed, nor, all things considered, is it more important in his development than are one or two others. And to these factors the graduate school pays little or no attention. If therefore such schools are looked upon as primarily for the purpose of doing the things which as a matter of actual fact they are bound to do, we are likely to reach the conclusion that the process as carried out in them is far from satisfactory, both in its principles and its methods. We may even go farther and conclude that no part of our educational system is in greater need of reappraisement, of examination of purpose and method, or reorganization in view of the needs of the time. But if such suggestions are made, we find that in no part of our educational system are those who have it in charge more confident that both principles and methods are valid, and more sure that the result represents the deciding word in educational progress. Nor do we find elsewhere such intolerance of objection, and such inclination to regard the objector either as mentally defective or as inspired by motives far from creditable. Nevertheless, as a training school for college teachers, the institution is justly subject to the criticism of doing only incompletely those things which it ought to do.

The man who knows his subject; who in addition has obtained in its realm information which was not known before; such a man is competent to teach that subject at any place, at any time, to any group. Such is the theory which governs the training in the graduate school, as far as it works on any conscious theory at all. No one will dispute the fundamental necessity of knowing on the part of the man who is to induce others to know, and no one would advocate a change which would affect deleteriously this element of the student's preparation. But to say that this element is the sole one to be considered, is to say something which is palpably untrue. The college teacher who knows well a narrow field, but who knows not how to impart that knowledge to others, who is ignorant of other fields and of the relationship of his subject to them, who has never grasped the idea of the unity of knowledge, whose intellectual curiosity is bounded within narrow limits, whose appreciation of a wide range of intellectual enjoyments has never been aroused; that man will never be effective in his chosen work. But such a product may well be produced by the graduate school, for all the institution consciously does to prevent that result.

Consider the course which must be followed by one who enters an institution of this type. Two tests he must successfully meet: one a series of searching examinations on all phases of the subject in question; and the other the successful pursuit of research, leading to a thesis which shall be a direct contribution to knowledge in the department concerned. The examinations are well enough, although they perhaps err on the side of excessive specialization, and present too few demands for a proper view of the position of the subject in question in the realm of knowledge. And they may be too largely tests of memory. The research leading to the thesis is also indispensable, but the requirement that the thesis itself be an "independent contribution to knowledge" may lead on the one hand to unfairness, and on the other to triviality. A mere catalogue of titles of some of the theses written in American universities on selected subjects would be sufficient in itself to bring the work for the doctorate into disrepute, although, to be fair, it must be said that these titles are hardly representative.

To meet these tests the young man sets himself to at least three years of the most laborious work. In the early part of

his course he has to do mainly with an intensive study of his subject: a study which is thorough and severe and so highly specialized as to leave room for nothing which does not bear directly on the point. As he advances he is assigned a "problem," which is to be the object of his field; he toils laboriously at it, he is immersed in that thing and that alone; he must attack every phase of the situation and solve every difficulty. Every thought must be centered on that issue, not usually because he is impelled by his own intense desire to find the answer of that particular question, but because his degree depends on finding that answer. It is not a bad training for any man to be compelled to do a difficult task of this kind; but such training may be overdone, and there is some reason to believe that in this particular case it is overdone.

The atmosphere of the graduate school is overwhelming in its narrow intensity. The individual is immersed in his specialty, his companions are likely to be men with the same interests, his teachers hold ever before him the essential importance of that particular thing. The force of necessity, the desire of accomplishing the job as soon as he can, keeps him continually at work; he spends in library or in laboratory more hours than are reasonable; his diversions are less than they ought to be. From the pressure ever upon him he is even unable to take refuge in the relaxation which comes from the change from one kind of mental work to another. It may be that he devotes some of his time to teaching—most students are compelled from financial necessity to do so, and universities partly from the very creditable desire to assist the man without means, and partly from the very practical reason that such teaching is the least expensive that can be obtained, provide assistantships for the purpose. Such experience is highly useful to the man in preparation for his future work; but it is not imposed by the institution as a part of the training of the teacher, nor is credit given for it. It increases the time required for the attainment of the degree, and it leads the student to enlarge his working day to even more unreasonable dimensions in the endeavor to reduce the period of his apprenticeship. At all times the student is subject to nervous strain: the dread of the examination which means so much; the fear lest the research be anticipated by some one else, making all the work of no avail; the not uncommon chance—particularly in natural

science—that after long labor it will be found that the particular problem simply will not go, despite every reason why it ought to. It may even happen, although fortunately such cases are not common, that the work may be under the direction of a teacher who is concerned very little with the needs of the student, but very much with the advancement of knowledge—which sometimes resolves itself into the advancement of his own reputation—and who therefore sets a problem unreasonable in its demands for time and perhaps with the chances all against the possibility of a successful solution. It is no wonder that physical and nervous breakdowns are not at all uncommon among students working under this pressure.

Of course the situation is not entirely dark. Presumably the individual is doing the work which he likes to do, and finds much enjoyment in the process. But, nevertheless, the method of the school tends by its requirements to take that enjoyment from the task more than it should and to impose demands which serve to make the work irksome.

We should expect the product of an institution in which the training was of this character to possess a wide knowledge of his particular subject, a complete mastery of some phase of it, and sufficient experience to make him capable of independent investigation in its field. In general that condition is found to be true. We should also expect, so far as the educational process is responsible for the result, that his range of interest and knowledge in things outside his field would be limited; that he would have a magnified idea of the appeal and importance of his specialty; that he would be inclined to minimize the place of subjects not related to it; that he would have a reverence for research almost religious in its nature, and a corresponding contempt for teaching; that his ignorance of the art of teaching would be profound, but one of which he was quite unconscious; that he would possess but a slight degree of real culture, and perhaps no consciousness of its advantages; that if he had to do with the college of liberal arts he would conceive its purpose to be much the same as that of the graduate school, he would use with his elementary students methods similar to those there applied, and when he found the purpose different and the methods ineffective he would form a very low opinion of the institution. We would not find all these undesirable traits to be true of any individual fresh from the graduate school;

we would find none of them in some favored ones. But we would find a sufficient mixture of them in most of the recent doctors of philosophy to make it perfectly evident that a severe readjustment of ideas is necessary if success in college teaching is to be theirs.

If the graduate school is to produce individuals whose after life is to be spent in the task of investigation, or if such men are to direct in their specialty students who have already made large progress, the process of the institution is well enough as it is. But is it not clear to anyone who knows the purpose of the college of liberal arts that such training for its teachers leaves out of consideration so many indispensable factors as to be obviously ineffective? We should graduate from our colleges, it is true, men who are to become scholars, and their preliminary training must be adequate; but the great bulk of our product will never be of this class; but men who are to do the ordinary work of the world and in whom we should inspire a wide general interest in the domain of knowledge. To train such men, we must have in our faculties teachers who, in addition to adequate acquaintance with those subjects which they are to teach, must above all things themselves possess that wide general interest. There seems to be little in the work of the graduate school, as now conducted, which would lead to that result.

How shall the work of the institution be modified so that that end can be gained? It is not difficult to state the guiding principle: one which is so obvious as to seem almost inane. *A school for the training of college teachers should base its instruction on that purpose as its primary motive.* Such is the method of the other professional schools; why should the graduate school be an exception? But now it has the announced purpose of working for the increase of human knowledge, or of pressing home the minute details of some branch of knowledge, or of training in research, and it turns out narrowly learned men skilled in investigation. Desirable enough is that skill in the teacher, but it is far from being all that is desirable or necessary. An institution which should first set itself to the task of finding out just what qualities the college teacher should have, and then, in view of those requirements, should fit intelligently its methods to the proper preparation of such men, would be attacking the problem in a way in which it has never been

approached before, and in a way which ought to be fruitful in its results.

While that principle stated above is all that is really needed, perhaps it would be well to be more specific, if misunderstandings are to be avoided. As a matter of fact, in such a school the division of work would not be essentially different from that at present: the difference would be in purpose and method; and would mainly be manifested in the atmosphere of the institution. Pedagogy at once comes to mind when such a plan is suggested, and that element should perhaps not be neglected, although the formal exactness which seems to characterize its application to the training of the teacher in the lower schools is to be avoided. In no case is it to be made a large feature of the work. We would have, as at present, detailed study of the subject matter of the selected field: a study both thorough and conscientious. But no department, conscious of the extent of its range, and solicitous that all be covered, should be allowed to make such excessive demands as to leave little time for anything else. If the work is properly outlined, the gaps which so annoy the "thorough" teacher may be left to be filled in by the pupil himself, should he later need to do so. Particularly the idea of relationships should be stressed, and no subject should be taught without wide reference to others. Research is of the utmost importance: it should perhaps occupy as much time as it now does, but conducted in no narrow spirit; with no demand that a "definite contribution to knowledge" be produced; and with a relaxation of the hampering requirements which now hedge the doctorial thesis. Publication should not be required, or permitted, unless the material available were obviously worth the effort. But no man should be permitted to graduate without a definite idea of what research is, and how it is to be done, and without testing his own capabilities in the field. There should be less of the feverish activity for a definite end, and more leisure for development along the lines of the student's own tastes. There should be abundant opportunities for social intercourse, and some attention should be paid to the amenities of life. Perhaps a social organization on the model of the Oxford College would not be ineffective. The attitude of those conducting the work should be based on an idea quite different from that which now prevails; they should have ever in mind the qualities which the college teacher must

have; and all their instruction should be with that end in view. No one should receive from the institution the stamp of its approval who did not possess both competence in his chosen field, and a broad intelligent outlook on knowledge as a whole.

It will be said a graduate of such an institution would be superficial, a dilettante, that he would lack scholarship. If the system were intelligently carried out, it is doubted if those terms could properly be applied to him, although it may be admitted that his scholarship would be less narrowly intense than it is in the product of the graduate school of today. He probably would know less of anything than the present doctor of philosophy does of some one thing; but he would know a great deal more of a wide variety of subjects, and he would be better able to utilize what he knew. After all, whatever epithets we may apply to him, would he not on the face of it appear to be better qualified for the work of college teaching? Would not the opportunity of such a training make a strong appeal to men obviously adapted to college work, who refuse to undertake the course of the present graduate school because it appeals to them as painfully meticulous and petty?

It is probable that, by concerted demands, colleges of liberal arts might obtain modification in enough graduate schools now existing, to better the situation. Such concerted action is not to be expected. College presidents admit that the difficulty of securing competent instructors is extreme, but they disagree as to the cause of the situation. Many of them think that the present training afforded by the graduate schools is, in principle, sound. Moreover, there is always present among educational authorities—and this is by no means limited to presidents—the fear lest action in opposition to generally accepted lines should mar the scholarly repute of their institutions. Thus no college has dared to draw teachers of elementary subjects from the ranks of instructors in the secondary schools; although many of these men are remarkably able teachers who have a satisfactory knowledge of their subject—and this despite the fact that at times really good men are extremely difficult to obtain. The degree of doctor of philosophy has a prestige in

---

The principles which are at the basis of the graduate school at Princeton University are in some ways similar to those here stated. The purpose of the school is much the same; but its teaching methods follow more closely ordinary practice. It is unfair to judge by superficial examination, but one gains the impression that the viewpoint of those doing the actual instruction is such that the deviations of the institution from other graduate schools (a deviation called for by its original plan) is less than might be expected.

itself which puts those who fix its requirements in a position of advantage. To limit professorial appointments to men holding the doctorate because such men bring with them a certain standard of learning, is defensible enough; but the reason in the background may be that such titles look well in the pages of the college catalogue. It is not the intention of the modification of the graduate school course here suggested to diminish the demands for scholarly work, and if properly carried out it would not have that effect; but that would be the interpretation sure to be put upon it. Such an interpretation would be fatal to the plan. What other remedy for the situation may exist, which is not open to this objection, is difficult to determine. But the situation is plain, and its disadvantages are fairly obvious. Until colleges of liberal arts can obtain in some way for their teaching staffs a better supply of men who have clearly in mind the purposes for which that institution stands, who are themselves in sympathy with those purposes, and who have been trained with the demands of college teaching ever in view, its work cannot be as effective as could be desired.

The Inexperienced Teacher

The path of the young teacher who is beginning his career in the college, unused as he is likely to be to the ways of the institution and filled with ideas derived from his graduate training, is not always made as smooth as it might be. While the notion of academic freedom and the policy of giving to the individual a large range of liberty to carry out his work in the way which seems to him best, are advantageous as a whole; at this point they are likely to do harm. There are many pitfalls in the way of the inexperienced, and the young teacher is likely to be turned loose with little warning of their existence. He usually finds that they are there by the effective method of falling into them, and of being required to extricate himself as best he may. This process does not always work out badly, but it is unpleasant while it is in operation, and it usually stretches to needless lengths. The result is detrimental both to student and to teacher. There is no part of our college machinery which seems to the young instructor so little developed along reasonable lines as the prevailing lack of provision for guidance to him

in his work. It is not only harmful in its effect on the young teacher, but it results in a condition under which no one in the institution is really well acquainted with his work or is in a position to pass a satisfactory judgment on how good or how bad it is.

The unfortunate results of this situation are not unrecognized, and various remedies have been suggested. The scheme of class visitation by presidents, or deans, or by college officers especially selected for the purpose, is sometimes advanced. It is to be doubted if this plan will work. It certainly would have little effect in the most important part of the task; that of assisting the instructor in his difficulties. Moreover judgments of teaching effectiveness formed in this way would be apt to be based on imperfect information, and information gained under circumstances disadvantageous to the instructor. The formality and infrequence of the visits, and the fact that both student and teacher would know exactly the nature of their purpose would combine to make the test hardly a fair one.

The matter does not, however, seem to be beyond remedy. Reliance may be placed on departmental responsibility. If the instruction is so organized that the members of the department act as a unit; if it is the general policy for each teacher to visit the classes of the others; if the older men feel that it is a part of their work to render assistance to those less experienced and to be, in a way, responsible for their development; if teaching problems are a common topic of discussion in departmental meetings; the results, both in their effect upon the inexperienced teacher, and upon the whole tone of departmental teaching, are sure to be good. Such a policy is in operation in many departments in our colleges, and its success is beyond doubt. It works better in those institutions in which departmental organization is more or less democratic, rather than an autocracy controlled by one man; but if given a fair chance it will work under any system. The obstacle which most stands in its way is the dominance in the department of men who take little interest in teaching as such; and who, while they tend to make their will prevail, really regard consideration of the problems of the teacher as rather beneath their dignity. But the need of oversight is so great and the advantages of a successful solution so obvious that it seems well worth while to introduce the system of depart-

mental responsibility as a general one. If direct pressure is brought on each department of the institution to make this process effective, and if it is asked to assume a responsibility for its younger men which really can be successfully assumed by no one else, there is little question that the results would be worth the effort.

Chapter XXXIV

STUDENT PARTICIPATION

TO what extent should the college encourage the participation of the student body in the discussion of its policies? That is a question upon which there is no general agreement, and concerning which, as a matter of fact, opinions are very sharply contradictory. On the one hand we have such assertions as those made, with an air of very definite finality, by one college teacher whose opinion was asked in the course of this investigation, to the effect that a faculty should be alive to what is going on and should then decide without regard to what the students think. The student never should worry himself in regard to educational methods; his function in the matter should be limited to the acceptance of those offered him. On the other hand we find a growing tendency on the part of the authorities of some colleges to obtain the opinions of representative students, and to lay increased weight upon the value of their judgment.

If the latter course is to be followed, certain factors of the situation should be kept in mind. In the first place, the individual student is a relatively temporary member of the college community. He does not have the opportunity, in the four years of his college course, really to understand the nature of the institution, and he certainly cannot know the details of its development. He cannot be aware that some of his pet theories may already have been tried and found wanting, he very seldom is in a position to view the situation in its large aspects or to weigh the effects of suggested change on the college as a whole. Again, student judgment in the mass is characterized by undue emphasis upon results which are expected to be pleasant, upon the removal of exactions, upon the process of making things easier than they were before. This tendency is true only when opinion is expressed without sense of responsibility; but it is true of a large portion of student opinion precisely because that responsibility is lacking. It is the general testimony of those whose experience in college administration

is large, that if a problem is set before a selected student group and they are told that weight is to be given to the results which they reach, no class of men is more successful in eliminating from the field considerations which have to do with personal ease and assumed personal advantage. In other words, the student body as a class will rise to responsibility as readily as any group, and perhaps more effectively than most. Again, we must remember that the judgment of large numbers of students, either from the fact that it has not yet had a chance to develop, or because there is nothing there to develop, is of very little value. Such a condition is not different from that found in general among all sorts of men. Finally—and this point is most important—men of student age are likely to be characterized in their judgments by contempt for authority, by underestimation of all that has been done, by rebellion against all that is considered settled merely because it is considered settled, by supreme cynicism in their estimate of what older men are doing, and what seems to be conceit—although it may not be that—in the estimate of the results of their own mental processes. Such a point of view is common to all youthful generations and it is that which always makes the generation next older—and never more than at present—look with forboding gloom upon civilization in the hands of its successors as on the road to utter degradation.

The last of these considerations is the only one which concerns us much in deciding as to the merits of student participation in the discussion of educational policies. It would seem at first glance that from the point of view resulting from such mental qualities little of advantage could come. As a matter of fact, does not that point of view contribute exactly the element which is needed? The control of college policies is largely in the hands of older men, who by the prestige of long service and of knowledge of the institution possess an influence which is greater than that of other groups. But age has its peculiar mental tendencies, as has youth. After forty, ideas are apt to become fixed; principles to be firmly established; theories to be regarded as though they were definite facts. In other words, if to the young man new ideas are likely to be given an over-favorable reception because they are new, the tendency is for the older man to bar out such ideas because they are not old. Of course it is not entirely a question of age; hoary radicals of

the most extreme type exist, as well as ultra-conservatives of tender years, but in general the tendency is that which we have described. If, therefore, a college faculty from the nature of its leadership tends toward conservatism, is it not of the utmost value to expose it to the shock of new ideas, however radical they may be; to place it always in the attitude from which self-complacency in viewing educational theories must be eliminated; in which the process of the college is ever under examination; and in which things as they are, are retained only because they seem on the whole more satisfactory than things that might be. To this advantage another may be added: the student knows facts concerning the working of the college system of which the faculty is likely to be profoundly ignorant. Although it is hardly possible to secure perfect frankness in the discussion of these facts—perhaps in faculty-student discussions it would not be well for frankness to go too far in either direction—information as to the general effect of important policies can be obtained; and from such information can be drawn deductions of the utmost value.

The policy of student participation has been most widely applied to questions involving discipline. This has been done, not so much on account of theoretical considerations of its advantage, as because of necessity. In no other way can the discipline of the institution be maintained. The college teacher of former days was both professor and policeman, and the shocks to which the impressive dignity imposed by the first part of his calling were subjected by the duties of the second must at times have been pathetic. But his successor in the modern college refuses to assume the role of detective, nor would he be tolerated as such by the student. So it is inevitable that the latter should take a large share in the necessary control of the institution. Methods vary. We have at one extreme organizations like Palaeopitus at Dartmouth, a body which has no formal powers, and whose authority depends entirely on the prestige which comes from the character of its membership; at the other, organizations like the Student Council of Princeton, which has definite authority in the settlement of cases at issue. Either system seems to work with a reasonable degree of efficiency.

It is not so much the question of discipline in which we are interested as that of student participation in discussions of

matters of college policy. Such participation is not a common practice, but it is by no means unknown. In some of the highly organized student councils questions of educational methods are often the subject of discussion, and student opinion is obtained when important changes of policy are contemplated. The report of a student committee at Dartmouth, which has constituted an important part of this investigation, has attracted rather unusual attention from the public press. At the University of Chicago during the past year an elaborate inquiry into various phases of the educational system has been in progress. At the start each senior was asked by the dean to make a written statement of the improvements which in his opinion were most needed for the proper development of the undergraduate college. One hundred twenty suggestions were received, and from these twenty-four were selected for investigation. For the consideration of each topic a committee consisting of both faculty and student members was constituted. The subjects, as might be expected, ranged from those merely local and relatively unimportant, such as the question of card playing in women's dormitories, to those of general importance, such as the quality of instruction in elementary courses, and undergraduate morale. These twenty-four committees were at work at the time Chicago was visited, and the outcome of their investigations was not then apparent, but while no startling changes are to be expected, there seems to be no reason to believe that the results will not be fruitful. It seems to be a fair conclusion that wherever student participation has been intelligently applied, the benefits gained are real and well worth the effort.

It is not to be understood that such participation is intended to extend to an assignment to students of a share in the final decision. No Soviet form of government is advocated. If for no other reason, the relatively brief period with which each student is associated with the institution would forbid that. The faculty must be solely responsible for the final decision. But it seems reasonable that such decisions can be more intelligently made if the point of view of responsible students is consulted, and that, while complexity of machinery is to be avoided, sufficient provision should be made so that this point of view may at all times be available.

Chapter XXXV

SUMMARY

OTHER interesting movements in the American college press for discussion, did space permit. In one institution plans are under consideration for dividing an ever enlarging college into separate units, each one largely autonomous, though knit together into a coherent whole. In this way some of the advantages of the older English university are hoped to be attained. In another university a faculty committee is working on a plan by which the division between college and graduate school shall come at a different point than it now does; with the lower instruction in the hands of an independent institution, neither college nor preparatory school, but something evolved from the two and embodying the best features of each, with others which are quite new; and with the graduate school stretched down to meet it. Neither of these plans have progressed beyond the stage of discussion. But there is no end to the consideration of varied phases of the problem of college education, unless an end be made by abrupt decision. From the length of this report such a decision seems long overdue, and had better be made at once.

Before closing, however, it seems well to summarize the object of this investigation, and the results which have been deduced.

The starting point is that the purpose of the college is to arouse in its students a real intellectual curiosity and interest. Certain handicaps stand in the way. To remove these handicaps is quite beyond the power of the institution. The college must count on the presence of extraneous factors which inevitably detract from the appeal of its central purpose. Therefore it must devote all its energies to the task of making the intellectual appeal so powerful and so attractive that other activities will occupy a properly subordinate place.

To accomplish this most difficult task the following suggestions have been made.

1. A curriculum based on the theory of capitalizing the interest of the individual.

2. An abandonment of the principle that acquaintance with certain subjects is an absolute necessity for the educated man, with the consequent elimination—except in Freshman year—of prescribed courses, or those with narrow options.

3. The provision for a major requiring a considerable portion of the later years of the course; a major which shall be planned as a coherent whole, and which shall call for work of a different type from that now required.

4. A provision for distribution, but one conceived in no narrowly rigid spirit.

5. Suitable guidance for the entering student, but guidance with the purpose of fitting him as soon as possible to assume responsibility for himself.

6. Complete elimination of the "snap" major.

7. The abandonment of separate arts and science degrees; or, if they are retained, a limitation of the requirements peculiar to each to the work of the preparatory school.

8. Decrease in the emphasis given to instruction by lectures.

9. Instruction, so far as possible to be given in small sections.

10. Insistence in the class room, as at present, on mastery of essential facts; but the main emphasis placed on the use to which the facts may be put.

11. Greater demands that the student think rather than memorize.

12. More discussion, but discussion based only on knowledge of something worth discussing—discussion restrained at all times by constant reference to fact.

13. Fewer courses in the last two years, with more concentrated work in each.

14. More carefully prepared examinations; the stress placed on intelligent application of facts, rather than the repetition of the bald facts themselves.

15. Greater use of examinations of the new type.

16. A comprehensive examination in the major subject; with no definite system of tutorial instruction.

17. Careful attention to students of exceptional capacity, so that they may be permitted to use that capacity to its utmost extent. Some form of the honors course.

18. Increase in the attractiveness of the position of the teacher in the attempt to draw a better class of men into college teaching.

19. Emphasis on good teaching, and assurance of due rewards to the teacher of proved excellence.

20. Reappraisement of the relative value of teaching ability and skill in research.

21. Assignment of teachers to their work on the basis of their tastes and their qualifications.

22. Increased emphasis on relationships in the field of knowledge, and of the essential unity of knowledge as a whole.

23. Increased attention of teachers to the general purpose of the college; and to the fitting of their own work to that purpose.

24. Graduate schools which shall have as a primary purpose the training of college teachers.

25. Greater attention by departments to the work of inexperienced men entering the instructing staff.

26. Student participation in discussions of college policy.

Probably no one can be found who will consider that all these changes are desirable; perhaps many will look with favor on very few of them. They are not set forth dogmatically as the way out; they merely embody material for discussion. Educational progress cannot be made by sudden spurts; nor can startling innovations in undue numbers be introduced all at once. A distinguished university president has said that you cannot make progress by hitching a team of zebras to a load of hay, and while it is not to be inferred that the conservatism of some faculty members is to be compared to the limited mobility of the load of hay, or the radicalism of others to the untameable wildness of the zebra, the comparison is an apt one. Educational progress is slow; advance must be preceded by careful consideration of the road which we are to take. The danger comes in taking no road at all; in the feeling that a stationary attitude is safe and therefore sane. It is desirable that a hitching post should be stationary, but the college is no hitching post to restrain by its immobility the onward progress of youth. The college is to guide, and it cannot guide unless it keeps ever in advance. The institution must be alive to the issues which surround it; it must perceive clearly what it is doing well and what it is doing ill; it must set its standards high and be ever active in the effort to attain those high aims.

So discussion becomes the vital necessity of the institution; we cannot move unless we have well considered whither we are to go, and which way is the best. This report has as its purpose the stimulation of such discussion: if that result is reached the purpose of the investigation has been attained.